MOUNT UNION COLLEGE
LIBRARY

Book No. 379.744-C968
Accession No. 24304
Gift of
Fund

Horace Mann and Religion in the Massachusetts Public Schools

YALE STUDIES IN THE HISTORY AND THEORY OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

EDITORS:

LUTHER ALLAN WEIGLE
ROBERT SENECA SMITH

I. A History of Religious Education in Connecticut to the Middle of the Nineteenth Century by George Stewart, Jr.

II. History of Religious Education in the Episcopal Church to 1835 by Clifton Hartwell Brewer.

III. Horace Mann and Religion in the Massachusetts Public Schools by Raymond B. Culver.

Horace Mann and Religion in the Massachusetts Public Schools

By Raymond B. Culver, Ph.D.



New Haven : Yale University Press
London : Humphrey Milford : Oxford University Press
Mcmxxix

MGE

379.744
C968h

24304

Copyright 1929 by Yale University Press.

Printed in the United States of America.

THE SAMUEL B. SNEATH MEMORIAL PUBLICATION FUND

The present volume is the third work published by the Yale University Press on the Samuel B. Sneath Memorial Publication Fund. This Foundation was established on October 19, 1922, by a gift to the Divinity School of Yale University from Mrs. Laura S. Sneath, of Tiffin, Ohio, in memory of her husband, Samuel B. Sneath. He was born on December 19, 1828, in Tiffin, where he resided until his death on January 7, 1915. As merchant, manufacturer, banker, and organizer of public utilities he made, throughout a long and public-spirited life, a substantial contribution to the development of his native state.

To My Father and Mother
Frank Dwight Culver and Sarah Walter Culver
I Dedicate This Book.

Acknowledgment

THE writing of history always involves a large division of labor. There are heavy obligations to many whose work has made resources available. The loving hands that carefully preserved the letters and papers of Horace Mann and arranged them in order, from those written in boyhood to the manuscripts prepared shortly before his death, placed the present writer especially in their debt.

To Luther Allan Weigle, Dean of the Yale Divinity School, I am chiefly indebted for wise and kindly guidance at every step in the preparation of this study. I would also acknowledge my debt to the late Henry Burt Wright, Stephen Merrell Clement Professor of Christian Methods in Yale Divinity School, for counsel and encouragement and for his inspiring example of accuracy in scholarship.

Mr. Julius H. Tuttle, Librarian of the Massachusetts Historical Society, has extended many courtesies; to him and to the Society I am grateful for permission to reproduce in an appendix the Packard-Mann correspondence.

My thanks are due to Mrs. J. W. D. Ingersoll, Miss Anne S. Pratt, Miss Emily H. Hall, and Mr. Henry Ginter, members of the staff of the Yale University Library, and to Mrs. Mary Robinson Reynolds, Assistant Librarian of the American Antiquarian Society, for assistance in discovering source material. I am grateful to Mr. Ernest L. Hayward of New Haven, Connecticut, who has read the proof and made valuable suggestions.

Especially am I indebted to my wife, Annabel Wood Culver, not only for help in the preparation of the manu-

script and the index, but also for her unfailing encouragement.

In its original form, this study was presented to the Faculty of the Yale Graduate School in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

RAYMOND B. CULVER.

Portland, Oregon, March 1, 1929.

Contents

	PAGE
I. Introduction	1
II. The Religious Situation in Massachusetts in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century	3
III. The Movement toward the Betterment of the Public Schools	19
IV. The Massachusetts School Library	41
V. The Packard Episode	55
VI. Packard Carries the Attack to the Newspapers	83
VII. The Founding of the Normal Schools	111
VIII. The Fight Is Carried to the Legislature	127
IX. The Fight Is Continued	149
X. The Cause Gains Ground	163
XI. Religious Aspects of Other Controversies	181
XII. Conclusion	217
Appendices	239
Bibliography	291
Index	297

Horace Mann

and Religion in the Massachusetts Public Schools

CHAPTER I

Introduction

IT has become a well-established tradition that Horace Mann was more responsible than any other person for the secularization of the public schools of Massachusetts. Mr. Mann and the Massachusetts Board of Education were accused of a conspiracy to exclude all religious instruction from the schools, and in its place to foist upon them a pagan system of ethics. These charges were made in various forms repeatedly and persistently during the twelve years of Mann's administration as Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, and were renewed as late as 1866 in an extended review of the *Life of Horace Mann.*

The purpose of this study is to determine just what was Horace Mann's relation to the teaching of religion in the Massachusetts schools. We shall keep in mind the following questions: What was the basis of these charges; why were they made? What were Mann's attitude and purpose; were the charges well founded? What was his influence on the teaching of religion in the schools?

The study is to a great extent based upon manuscript sources. In addition to Mr. Mann's published writings, and the *Life of Horace Mann,* by his wife, extensive use has been made of his manuscript letters and papers. This collection, which for the purposes of this study will be known as the "Mann Papers," contains several thousand letters written by Mr. Mann, or written by others to him, as well as many of his addresses. They are the property of the Massachusetts Historical Society in

Boston. Extracts from many of the letters are quoted, and, unless other reference is given, it is to be understood that the document used is among the "Mann Papers." One of the most valuable documents in the collection is the manuscript of Mr. Mann's Journal which he began to keep a short time before he entered upon the work of the Secretaryship. This Journal covers the period between 1837 and 1843. Mrs. Mann frequently quoted from it in the *Life,* but occasionally omitted valuable historical details. For this reason all quotations from the Journal are taken directly from the manuscript.

The present work is in no sense a life of Horace Mann, nor has anything like a complete record of all his work as Secretary of the Board of Education been attempted. The temptation to include other attractive material has with difficulty been overcome in order that attention might be given to the questions at issue.

CHAPTER II

The Religious Situation in Massachusetts in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century

I. RELIGIOUS PARTIES AND SECTS AT THE OPENING OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

DURING the first half of the nineteenth century the religious situation in Massachusetts was such as to beset with difficulty any work of reform in education, by whomsoever attempted.

At the opening of the century there were three parties in the Congregational church. Their divergence was one of the results of the "Great Awakening," as the revival movement was called which had begun in 1734, under Jonathan Edwards' preaching in Northampton. These three parties were beginning to be defined by the time of Whitefield's second visit to America in 1744.[1] On the one hand were the Calvinists, who divided into two schools, the "Old Calvinists" and the "New Lights," and on the other were the "Liberals," who rejected Calvinism.

The "Old Calvinists" held to the historic teachings of Calvinism. They exalted the absolute sovereignty of God. They believed that human nature is totally depraved, inheriting the sin and guilt of Adam. Man's only hope of salvation is through grace, imputing to him the atoning merits of Christ's sacrifice. This grace is arbitrarily bestowed; it is the gift of God to those whom he has chosen, or "elected," and is by them irresistibly

[1] Williston Walker, *A History of the Congregational Churches in the United States,* pp. 256-279. Rev. George Whitefield, the eloquent young English preacher and leader in the "Great Awakening," first visited New England in 1740. Wherever he preached, great crowds thronged to hear him. He laid much stress upon the emotional demonstrations of his converts, and by his severe criticism of the resident ministers created opposition. Subsequent visits were made in 1744, 1754, and 1770. Walker describes him as the "prime human factor in the greatest religious overturning that New England has ever experienced."

received. With this central scheme of doctrine, the Old Calvinists associated a view of the Trinity which practically amounted to tritheism, and a view of the Scriptures which looked upon them as the direct, dictated Word of God. And, somewhat inconsistently, they attributed a degree of saving value to the cultivation and use of what they called the "means of grace." They believed that such exercises as prayer, reading the Bible, attendance upon the services of the church, and even partaking of the communion, are not merely expressions of the Christian life, but can and ought to be employed by the unsaved as aids to obtaining the grace of God necessary to conversion.[2]

The "New Light" or "New Divinity" school originated with Jonathan Edwards, and was developed by Samuel Hopkins and Nathaniel Emmons. Adherents to this group of Calvinists were often called "Strict Calvinists" and "Consistent Calvinists" as well as "Edwardeans" and "Hopkinsians." In contrast to the Old Calvinists, the New Lights, while retaining the traditional views of the Bible and the Trinity, taught the extreme doctrine that the employment of any "means of grace" is a manifestation of self-love and is therefore sin. God's sovereignty was exalted so as to make him the ultimate cause of all things, even of sin. Nathaniel Emmons held that God brings all men into the world in a condition of moral depravity which is not an inheritance of Adam's sin, as the Old Calvinists believed, but which is nevertheless a consequence of it. God creates men with a bias to sin; but the act of sin is an exercise of the will, totally distinct from God's operation on the mind, and it therefore follows that man is guilty, while God's honor is preserved. Selfishness is the essence of sin, and as all men are depraved and selfish, they are the guilty victims of self-love. To seek one's own salvation is selfish and is therefore an evidence of sin. Since the essence

[2] W. Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 292. See also G. L. Walker, *Some Aspects of the Religious Life of New England with Special Reference to Congregationalists*, pp. 128 ff.

of sin is selfishness, it follows that the essence of holiness is complete unselfishness, or "disinterested benevolence," and absolute submission to the will of God. The Deity may elect to work a regeneration in the "heart" of the sinner that will cause him to choose the right; but as the economy of the universe requires that some souls shall be eternally lost, all cannot be pardoned. Absolute submission of the individual's will to God thus means a willingness to be one of those unhappy mortals predestined from the foundation of the world to be damned in order that God's sovereign government may be vindicated. Indeed, one of the tests of the validity of conversion in that day was a willingness "to be damned for the glory of God."[3]

Edwards, Hopkins, and Emmons were all graduates of Yale College, as were most of the other leaders among the New Lights, and their doctrines were widely accepted in Connecticut and in central and western Massachusetts.[4] Edwards was pastor at Northampton in 1727 and was dismissed in 1750. He was pastor at Stockbridge nearly seven years before accepting a call in 1758 to become president of Princeton College. He died March 22, 1758, just as he was beginning his new work. Hopkins was pastor at what is now Great Barrington from 1743 to 1769. Emmons, who as a "Consistent Calvinist" carried the Hopkinsian theology to its extremest development, was pastor at Franklin from 1773 to 1827. Here, as a boy, Horace Mann heard his stern doctrines preached and gained impressions of Calvinism that remained with him throughout his life.

[3] "He who has a new heart, and universal disinterested benevolence, will be a friend to God, and must be pleased with his infinitely benevolent character, though he see not the least evidence, and has not a thought, that God loves him and designs to save him. And if he could know that God designed, for his own glory and the general good, to cast him into endless destruction, this would not make him cease to approve of his character; he would continue to be a friend of God, and to be pleased with his moral perfection."—*The Works of Samuel Hopkins, D.D., First Pastor of the Church in Great Barrington, Mass., afterwards pastor of the First Congregational Church in Newport, R. I. With a Memoir of his Life and Character* (3 vols.), I, 389.

[4] W. Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 280.

The liberalizing movement, led by such men as Rev. Jonathan Mayhew of the West Side Church in Boston, Rev. Charles Chauncy of the First Church, and Rev. Samuel Briant, pastor in Braintree, had quietly developed during the last half of the eighteenth century. It continued to grow until events, presently to be related, made the Unitarian controversy and schism inevitable.

The Liberals agreed with both the Old Calvinists and the New Lights in believing that the Bible was God's revelation, although, as Dean Fenn[5] reminds us, they interpreted it rationally and laid greater emphasis on the progressive character of the revelation which the Bible contained, regarding the New Testament of greater value than the Old. But in four points[6] they differed from both groups of Calvinists, who later came to be known, collectively, as the "Orthodox." In the first place, the Liberals believed that the Bible does not teach the doctrine of the Trinity in the tritheistic form which was held by the Orthodox. In the second place, they stressed the humanity of Christ, although, as William Ellery Channing wrote in 1815, the majority of the Liberals at that time believed in his preëxistence, that he was more than a man, and that he had been sent as the Savior to reveal the Father's love, while a smaller number believed in the simple humanity of Jesus. In contrast to the Calvinists, they rejected, in the third place, the doctrine of human depravity. The Liberals believed in the inherent dignity and worth of man, and maintained that as a child of God, created in his image, the divine elements were already in him. Dean Fenn points to this conviction as the explanation for the large interest in education for which they have been distinguished. Such a view of human nature resulted in a fourth point of disagreement with the Orthodox position. Since man's nature is not totally depraved, then

[5] William W. Fenn, "The Unitarians," one of the *King's Chapel Lectures on the Religious History of New England*, pp. 118 ff.

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 119 ff.

regeneration is unnecessary. The divine elements within him, though often choked by sin, must be given opportunity by education and training to become the controlling forces in his life.

In addition to these three groups in the Congregational church, which as the established church, from the earliest days of the Colony, had constituted the majority in Massachusetts, several sects of Dissenters had become factors of increasing importance in the religious life of the Bay State. Baptists, Quakers, and Episcopalians, in spite of severe persecution, had won recognition and legal standing by 1728. The beginnings of the Methodists and Universalists in Massachusetts may be roughly dated with the Revolutionary period. In theology the Episcopalians and Baptists were Calvinistic, although a sect of the latter known as "Free Will Baptists," together with the Methodists, held to the Arminian doctrine of the freedom of the will to accept a salvation freely offered to all men. The chief distinguishing characteristic of the Quakers was their belief in the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit. The Universalists, with their doctrine of salvation for all men, were, with few exceptions, Unitarian in theology. In 1800 there was one Catholic church in Boston. The Catholic diocese of Boston which was erected in 1808 included New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts (including Maine), Rhode Island, and Connecticut. In all of this territory there were only three Catholic churches.[7]

The relative strength of the sects in 1800 may be judged by the number of churches in each as given by Dr. Joseph S. Clark,[8] whom Williston Walker[9] describes as "a careful student of Massachusetts ecclesiastical history:"

Congregationalists	344	Methodists	29
Baptists	93	Episcopalians	14

[7] Thomas O'Gorman, *A History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States*, p. 309.

[8] Joseph S. Clark, *A Historical Sketch of the Congregational Churches in Massachusetts from 1620 to 1858*, pp. 7-10.

[9] W. Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 343.

Quakers	8	Presbyterians[10]	2
Universalists	4	Roman Catholics	1

Dr. Clark also gives a statistical table for 1858 which shows the growth of the sects after 1800:

Orthodox Congregationalists	490
Episcopal Methodists	277
Baptists	266
Unitarians	170
Universalists	135
Episcopalians	65
Roman Catholics	64
Christians	37
Friends Meetings	24
Free-will Baptists	21
Protestant or Independent Methodists	20
Second Adventists	15
Wesleyan Methodists	13
Swedenborgians	11
Presbyterians	7
Shakers	4
Unclassified	12

II. THE UNITARIAN SCHISM

THE half-century following the period of the Great Awakening had experienced a cooling of the spiritual fervor by which the revival had been marked. There was a strong reaction from the emotional excesses of the Whitefield revivals. Doctrinal controversies had been waged prior to the great struggle of the Revolution, and though men gave little attention to theology during the next twenty years, the cleft between the Liberals and the Orthodox was quietly widened. But in the last decade of the eighteenth century there began a movement which has been variously called the "Evangelical Reawakening"[11] and the "Orthodox Reaction,"[12] the term used depending upon the point of view. Chadwick believes that but for this "reaction" the liberal-

[10] The Presbyterians were Calvinistic in doctrine, and in most respects resembled the Congregationalists, their chief difference being in their form of organization.

[11] G. L. Walker, *op. cit.*, pp. 126 ff.

[12] John White Chadwick, *William Ellery Channing, Minister of Religion*, p. 112.

izing process would have gone on until it would have captured all of New England in less than another half-century.

In 1791 a revival started in North Yarmouth, Maine. From this beginning the movement spread throughout the New England states. The years from 1797 to 1801 were notable for the profound spiritual awakening that was experienced. In 1802 there was a revival in Yale College. The movement continued in many parts of New England, recurring at more or less irregular intervals until as late as 1858.[13] It resulted in stimulating many forms of religious activity and hastened the impending rupture between the Liberals and the Orthodox.

Just at the dawn of the new century, the old Pilgrim Church at Plymouth had called a Liberal minister, Rev. James Kendall. Shortly after his ordination, almost one-half of the members of the church withdrew and organized a church based on the Calvinistic creed. In 1805 the contest for the Hollis Professorship of Divinity in Harvard College, left vacant two years before by the death of Rev. Dr. David Tappan, an Old Calvinist, was won by the Liberals, and Rev. Henry Ware of Hingham, Massachusetts, was chosen by the Board of Overseers. His election marked the loss of Puritan Harvard to the Liberal school. To meet this loss the two Calvinistic parties, each without the other's knowledge, began plans to found a school of divinity in eastern Massachusetts. Becoming aware of each other's projects, proposals were made to unite their forces against the common foe. Although for a time the attempt seemed doomed to failure because of apparently irreconcilable differences, a compromise was at last effected, resulting in a patched-up creed which formed the basis of the joint movement, and the Andover Theological Seminary was founded in 1808.[14]

The following year Park Street Church was organized in Boston, and in 1811 Rev. Dr. Edward D. Griffin was settled

[13] W. Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 320.
[14] G. L. Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 155. See also W. Walker, *op. cit.*, pp. 348-352.

as its pastor to preach a vigorous "New Divinity" or "Hopkinsian" theology in a manner heretofore unknown to Boston.[15] At about the same time a most effective method of exclusion of liberal ministers from fellowship with the Orthodox was begun under the leadership of Rev. John Codman, of Dorchester. It had long been the custom for ministers frequently to exchange pulpits. Codman now refused to exchange with Liberals, and though by so doing he narrowly escaped expulsion from his own church at the hands of a council called by his parishioners, his action was followed by many of his fellow ministers eager to preserve the purity of the ancient faith.[16] In spite of these attempts at exclusion, the Liberal ministers and churches remained in the Congregational denomination.

But in 1815 a pamphlet of forty-eight pages, entitled *American Unitarianism,*[17] was published in Boston; this was destined to be the wedge which should completely split the two groups asunder. It was an extract from the *Memoirs of the Life of the Reverend Theophilus Lindsey,* by Rev. Thomas Belsham, the leader of English Unitarians. Williston Walker[18] says it was probably published at the instance of Rev. Jedediah Morse, the pastor of the Congregational church at Charlestown. Morse, with his son Sidney E. Morse, and Nathaniel Willis, on whose press the pamphlet was printed, founded the Orthodox newspaper, the *Boston Recorder,* in 1815.

The extract from the *Memoirs* contained letters from Rev. James Freeman and other prominent Boston men reporting the

[15] W. Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 337.

[16] J. W. Chadwick, *op. cit.*, p. 118. See also W. Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 338.

[17] *American Unitarianism; or a Brief History of "The Progress and Present State of the Unitarian Churches in America." Compiled, from Documents and Information communicated by the Rev. James Freeman, D.D., and William Wells, Jun. Esq. of Boston, and from other Unitarian Gentlemen in this Country, by Rev. Thomas Belsham, Essex-Street, London. Extracted from his "Memoirs of the Life of the Reverend Theophilus Lindsey," printed in London, 1812, and now published for the benefit of the Christian Churches in this Country, without note or alteration* (Boston, 1815).

[18] W. Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 338.

progress of the Liberal movement in America. Freeman was the minister of King's Chapel in Boston, the church which had formerly been Episcopalian but had become Unitarian in 1787. The extract was prefaced by an article which identified the Liberals of Massachusetts with the English Unitarians, charged them with seeking to conceal from the public the implications of their doctrines, and called upon them to declare themselves. The publication of the pamphlet was followed by a review in the *Panoplist,* a paper founded in 1805 to combat Liberalism. The reviewer, who was probably Jeremiah Evarts,[19] a member of Morse's church, reaffirmed the identification of the Liberals with the English Unitarians, and said that henceforth the fact would be recognized "that Unitarianism is the predominant religion among the ministers, and churches of Boston." The Liberals were said to believe that Jesus was a mere man, and were charged with infidelity, hypocrisy, and cowardice. The publication of the pamphlet, *American Unitarianism,* and the review in the *Panoplist* forced the hand of the Liberals,[20] and Rev. William Ellery Channing, pastor of the Federal Street Church, entered the "Unitarian Controversy" as their leader.

Channing's first article was a letter to Rev. Samuel C. Thacher, a fellow Liberal, and was published in pamphlet form.[21] He protested against the identification of the Boston Liberals with the English Unitarians, who were known to believe in the simple humanity of Jesus, and continued:

The word *Unitarianism,* as denoting this opposition to Trinitarianism, undoubtedly expresses the character of a considerable part of the

[19] W. Walker, *op. cit.,* p. 339. A copy of this review in the *Panoplist* reprinted in pamphlet form, is in the Yale University Library.

[20] Joseph Henry Allen, *Historical Sketch of the Unitarian Movement Since the Reformation,* p. 192.

[21] *A Letter to the Rev. Samuel C. Thacher, on the Aspersions contained in a Late Number of the Panoplist, on the Ministers of Boston and the Vicinity,* by William E. Channing, Minister of the Church of Christ in Federal Street, Boston (2d ed.; Boston: Printed and published by Wells and Lilly, 1815). A copy is in the Yale University Library.

ministers of this town and its vicinity, and the Commonwealth. But we both of us know, that their Unitarianism is of a very different kind from that of Mr. Belsham. We both agreed in our late conference, that a majority of our brethren believe, that Jesus Christ is more than man, that he existed before the world, that he literally came from heaven to save our race, that he sustains other offices than those of a teacher and witness to the truth, and that he still acts for our benefit, and is our intercessor with the Father. This we agreed to be the prevalent sentiment of our brethren. There is another class of liberal christians, who, whilst they reject the distinction of three persons in God, are yet unable to pass a definite judgment on the various systems, which prevail, as to the nature and rank of Jesus Christ. They are met by difficulties on every side, and generally rest in the conclusion, that *He,* whom God has appointed to be our Saviour, must be precisely adapted to His work, and that acceptable faith consists in regarding and following Him as our Lord, Teacher, and Saviour; without deciding on his nature or rank in the universe. There is another class, who believe the simple humanity of Jesus Christ; but these form a small proportion of the great body of Unitarians in this part of our country; and I very much doubt, whether of these, one individual can be found, who could conscientiously subscribe to Mr. Belsham's creed as given in the Review.[22]

Denying the charge that any attempt had been made by the Liberals to keep their doctrines secret, he said:

As to myself, I have ever been inclined to cherish the most exalted views of Jesus Christ, which are consistent with the supremacy of the Father; and I have felt it my duty to depart from Mr. Belsham, in perhaps every sentiment which is peculiar to him on this subject.[23]

Channing deplored the possibility of any sort of schism and expressed the hope that no separate sect of Liberals would be established. He closed with an expression of his willingness to consider any reply which should be written in a Christian and gentlemanly spirit. To this letter a reply was made by Rev. Samuel Worcester,[24] pastor of the Tabernacle Church in Salem.

[22] *A Letter to the Rev. Samuel C. Thacher,* pp. 6, 7. [23] *Ibid.,* p. 12.

[24] Worcester's letters and Channing's replies are in the Yale University Library.

Channing answered, and received a second reply. His third article brought a third letter from Worcester, and other writers and speakers entered the controversy. Channing and the Liberals soon adopted the name "Unitarian," and the spiritual division between Orthodox and Liberals was complete. In 1819 Channing preached a sermon at the ordination of Jared Sparks in Baltimore,[25] in which he set forth the position of the Liberals. He protested against the current tritheism of the Orthodox, and exalted the moral character of God. He believed that Jesus Christ had been sent, not to die in order to render the Father merciful, but rather that he had been "sent by the Father's mercy to be our Savior." The idea that God must be placated, that his wrath must be quenched, was rejected "with horror." "We conceive, that Jesus is dishonoured, not glorified, by ascribing to him an influence, which clouds the splendour of divine benevolence."[26]

At this juncture the Supreme Court decision in the famous "Dedham Case" gave a new and unexpected aspect to the aggressive Orthodox policy of exclusion, which was to have far-reaching results.

In order to understand the issues involved, it is necessary to keep in mind the close relation which had always existed between the church and the state. We have said that from the earliest period, the Congregational church had been the established, or state church. In May, 1631, the General Court ordered that none but members of churches should be admitted to citizenship,[27] a limitation which, though modified in 1664, was continued till the charter was revoked by Charles II in 1684. The new charter, granted by William and Mary in 1691, removed all ecclesiastical tests for the franchise and granted

[25] *A Sermon delivered at the Ordination of the Rev. Jared Sparks, to the Pastoral Care of the First Independent Church of Baltimore, May 5, 1819.* By William Ellery Channing, Minister of the Church of Christ in Federal Street, Boston (2d ed.; Baltimore, 1819). A copy is in the Yale University Library.

[26] *Ibid.*, pp. 33, 34.

[27] W. Walker, *op. cit.*, pp. 114, 115.

liberty of conscience in the worship of God to all except Papists. Although it appears that a voluntary system of church support was at first attempted, a law was passed in 1638 providing for an assessment on all who should not voluntarily contribute to the church expenses.[28] In Boston the system of taxation for the support of the church was never adopted, but elsewhere it soon became the current practice and was reinforced by the Law of 1652.[29] In 1727-1729 Episcopalians, Quakers, and Baptists were permitted to have their taxes paid to the support of their own churches, provided they belonged to societies in the towns where they resided.

When the Bill of Rights was adopted in 1780, the system of taxation for the support of the churches was retained. All were taxed, and all taxes were paid to the established church, unless the "subject" paying them designated that they be applied to the support of the "teacher" of his own sect upon whose instruction he was an attendant. The legislature was empowered to require the towns to provide for the support of "public Protestant teachers," and attendance upon their instructions was enjoined upon all "subjects," "if there be any on whose instruction they can conscientiously and conveniently attend." In 1811 the Religious Freedom Act[30] was passed, enabling unincorporated dissenting churches to recover from the town treasurer taxes paid by their members. This law also made it possible for anyone to leave the established Congregational church and join a dissenting society in the same town, provided he brought to the town clerk or treasurer a certificate to show he had made such a change.

Prior to the adoption of the Bill of Rights in 1780, although all were taxed for the support of the church, only the church members were authorized to select the minister. After the Char-

[28] W. Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 232. See also Edward Buck, *Massachusetts Ecclesiastical Law*, pp. 24, 36.

[29] Buck, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 43.

ter of 1691 abolished all ecclesiastical tests for the franchise, a law was passed in 1692[31] giving to the town the power to call the minister. This action was reversed by a law adopted the following year,[32] which directed that the church should elect, this choice to be concurred in by the town. A further measure passed in 1695[33] provided that in case of failure to concur, the question should be submitted to a church council. But with the adoption of the Constitution in 1780, the authority for choosing the minister was given to the citizens who were taxed for his support, whether members of the church or not. The provision in the third article of the Declaration of Rights reads:

> *Provided, notwithstanding,* That the several towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies politic, or religious societies, shall, at all times, have the exclusive right of electing their public teachers, and of contracting, with them for their support and maintenance.[34]

While some writers have been inclined to believe that this provision which reversed the ancient usage of the church in calling a minister was due to an oversight, and that its full import was not apprehended, Buck[35] reminds us that it was framed and adopted by men who had been fighting a long war against the principle of taxation without representation. However this may be, it is important to note that although the legal right to settle the minister was now vested in the citizens who paid the taxes, the ancient usage whereby the church took the initiative and the town or parish[36] voted to concur was continued.

Such was the situation when, in 1818, the minister of the First Church in Dedham, Rev. Joshua Bates, a man who held

[31] *Province Laws,* chap. 26, sec. 4, November 4, 1692.
[32] *Ibid.,* chap. 43, secs. 7, 8, February 17, 1693.
[33] *Ibid.,* chap. 8, sec. 1, June 13, 1695.
[34] Franklin B. Hough, *American Constitutions,* I, 623.
[35] Buck, *op. cit.,* p. 50. See also Fenn, *op. cit.,* p. 107.
[36] The parish was a geographical division of the town, with exact metes and bounds, for ecclesiastical purposes. All persons living in the parish were taxed for the support of the church in that parish unless especially exempted. Buck, *op. cit.,* pp. 15-23.

to the New Light theology, resigned to become president of Middlebury College. The First Church Parish, a large majority of the members of which were of Liberal sentiments, decided to take the initiative and call a Liberal minister, Rev. Alvan Lamson. The members of the church refused by a vote of seventeen to fifteen to concur in the vote of the Parish. One member having voted with the minority by mistake, the result was corrected to stand eighteen to fourteen, two less than a majority of the voting (or male) membership, which was thirty-eight.[37] The Parish, however, called a council which after two days decided to ordain Mr. Lamson. Among the delegates were such leading Unitarians as Dr. William Ellery Channing, Dr. John T. Kirkland, president of Harvard University, Rev. James Walker, afterward president of Harvard, and Dr. Henry Ware, Sr., Professor of Divinity in Harvard.

The Orthodox portion of the church now withdrew, refused to attend upon the services of the church, and established themselves on the opposite side of the street. They claimed to be the First Church in Dedham, with the right to hold the property of the church. The question as to which party constituted the First Church and owned the church property and funds was carried to the Supreme Court in an action of replevin prosecuted by the deacons newly elected by the faction remaining in the church.

The decision,[38] given in an opinion by Chief Justice Parker at the November term in 1820, was a victory for the Parish. It was held that the only church which could be legally considered the First Church in Dedham must be the church in the First Parish. Moreover, the court was of the opinion that no church which had existed within a parish could withdraw from the parish and yet retain the property.

[37] *Covenant of the First Church in Dedham, with some Facts of History and Illustration of Doctrine. For the Use of the Church* (Dedham, Mass., 1878), pp. 22-25. See also Buck, *op. cit.*, pp. 50 ff.

[38] *Massachusetts Reports*, XVI, 487-522.

The position taken by the Supreme Court was clear. Whatever hardship the decision might work upon the churches, the law upheld the action of the parish, and the democratic principle that those taxed for the support of the church had a right to decide in the choice of its minister was strictly adhered to.

The results of the decision were far-reaching. Parish after parish throughout the eastern part of the state called Liberal ministers, and one after another there began to appear "second churches" founded by the Orthodox groups whose loyalty to their faith led them to secede. The Liberal ministers and laymen who had been disfellowshiped by the Orthodox, and who, after the Channing letters to Worcester, had accepted the name "Unitarian," began to organize as a sect, and in 1825 the American Unitarian Association was founded. Meanwhile the process of separation, even at great sacrifice of material interests on the part of the Orthodox, was going on. Dr. Joseph S. Clark, writing in 1858, stated that by 1836 eighty-one churches had been divided, and 3,900 evangelical members had withdrawn, leaving property valued at $608,958 to be used by the 1,282 Unitarian members who remained. By 1840 ninety-six churches which had been of the old Puritan faith had passed over into Unitarianism, fifteen of them without schism, and thirty additional parishes had excluded evangelical preaching from their pulpits, resulting in the "withdrawal of the churches from their meeting houses." The total number of places of worship with their parish funds and other property which, according to Dr. Clark, were "lost to the cause of evangelical religion and gained to the opposite," was thus one hundred and twenty-six. In 1840 the total number of Unitarian churches was one hundred and thirty-five, of which twenty-four had been founded by Unitarian enterprise; the Orthodox Congregational churches numbered four hundred and nine.[39]

[39] J. S. Clark, *op. cit.*, pp. 269-272. In an appendix, Dr. Clark prints a summary of a "Report on Exiled Churches" presented to the General Association of Massachusetts in 1836.

The Dedham decision and the consequences which flowed from it, with all the bitterness and heartburnings engendered by the separations, were but the results of the union of church and state so long defended by the Standing Order, and so long opposed by the Dissenters. The instrument by which Orthodoxy had long strengthened and perpetuated itself had become an engine of destruction. Orthodox opposition to complete religious freedom now came to an end; in 1833 the Bill of Rights was amended,[40] the Congregational church was disestablished, and the long battle fought by the Dissenters in Massachusetts had been won.

But the victory for religious freedom had been won at great cost. Strong words had been used; the Unitarians had been called "robbers" and "infidels," while the Orthodox had been looked upon as "bigots" and "fools." Anger and resentment had flamed, and jealousy and suspicion were rife. At such a time, and in the midst of such bitterness, Horace Mann began his work as the first Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education.

[40] Hough, *op. cit.*, I, 651.

CHAPTER III

The Movement toward the Betterment of the Public Schools

THE passage of the Law of 1837, which created the Board of Education and provided for the Secretaryship of the Board, was achieved only after years of agitation had prepared the public mind for this step. The common schools, the glory of Massachusetts, founded with Puritan faith and vision, had for many decades fallen into neglect. The factors contributing to their decline are well known and need not be traced in detail here.[1] Chief among them may be mentioned the privations of the rough frontier life which obtained where new settlements were being carved out of the wilderness, the hardships of the Indian wars and the Revolution, the growth of private schools, and the development of the district system, that last word in pure democracy.[2]

Early in the 'twenties, due primarily to the tireless efforts of James G. Carter,[3] a new interest in the common schools had

[1] George H. Martin, *The Evolution of the Massachusetts Public School System, A Historical Sketch,* pp. 69-130. See also B. A. Hinsdale, *Horace Mann and the Common School Revival in the United States,* pp. 9-19.

[2] The school law of 1789 legalized the division of the town into school districts. In 1800 the districts were given power to tax themselves for the support of the schools. The Law of 1817 made the districts corporations, and in 1827 the towns where districts had been organized were directed to elect, or cause the districts to elect, a prudential committeeman for each district, whose duties should include the selection and employment of the teacher for his district and the care of the school property (*Acts and Laws of Mass.,* June 25, 1789, chap. 19; *ibid.,* February 18, 1800, chap. 66; *Laws of Mass.,* June 13, 1817, chap. 14; *ibid.,* March 10, 1827, chap. 143, sec. 6). G. H. Martin says the year 1827 "marks the utmost limit to the subdivision of American sovereignty—the high-water mark of modern democracy, and the low-water mark of the Massachusetts school system" (p. 92).

[3] Henry Barnard, *American Educational Biography, Memoirs of Teachers, Educators, and Promoters of Education, Science and Literature,* pp. 182 f. Barnard says that to Carter, "more than to any other one person, belongs the credit

been aroused which found expression in the passage of legislation for the improvement of the schools. Graduating from Harvard in 1820, Carter opened a private school in Lancaster, Massachusetts, and soon began writing articles on popular education which appeared in the Boston newspapers. In 1824 he published a pamphlet entitled *Letters to the Hon. William Prescott, LL.D., on the Free Schools of New England, with Remarks on the Principles of Instruction,* in which he traced the legislation of Massachusetts in behalf of public schools and called attention to the neglect into which they had fallen. He pointed out that the schools were suffering from two principal evils, "incompetent instructors and bad school books." In the winter of 1824-1825 he wrote six essays which appeared in the *Boston Patriot* with the signature of "Franklin." These were published in pamphlet form in 1826.[4] In the *Essays* Carter again reminded his readers of the serious neglect of the public schools, and in the sixth essay presented an able plan for the training of teachers. The *Letters* and the *Essays,* which were favorably reviewed in leading journals,[5] attracted much attention and had a large influence on the passage of the Law of 1826.

The Law of 1826[6] put a check upon the district system by providing that every town should choose annually a school committee which should be responsible for the superintendence of all the town schools and should select the textbooks to be used in them. The law further directed that no teacher was to be employed by the districts who had not first been examined and certified by the town committee. This encroachment upon the

of having first arrested the attention of the leading minds of Massachusetts, to the necessity of immediate and thorough improvement in the system of free or public schools, and of having clearly pointed out the most direct and thorough mode of procuring this improvement."

[4] James G. Carter, *Essays upon Popular Education, containing a Particular Examination of the Schools of Massachusetts, and an Outline of an Institution for the Education of Teachers.*

[5] *North American Review,* October, 1824, pp. 448 f.; January, 1827, pp. 156 f.

[6] *Laws of Mass.,* vol. 10, chap. 170, March 4, 1826.

authority of the districts brought an immediate protest, and in some cases a refusal to obey the provisions of the law, as is seen in the following extract from the manuscript report of the Committee on Education in the House of Representatives in 1827:

> Your Committee expect the most valuable results from the operation of the law of March last, relating to schools. They regret that the salutary provisions of that law have not been carried into effect, in every town in the Commonwealth, more especially they regret, that any portion of the community should have entertained, as they find has been the case, apprehensions of the tendency of that law to impair, or to wrest from them their rights. It is hoped that the modifications which they have proposed in that law, will, at least, evince to the people their desire to protect them against any injurious tendency which the law might, otherwise, be supposed to have. If the law, as it is now reported, shall not prove acceptable to all, it should be attributed to the unavoidable imperfection, which attends the first essay in any new project; and the people ought to rest satisfied, that if it shall be found, after full and fair experiment, that any deficiencies, or injurious provisions, do actually exist in the law, it will undergo such modifications as to do them away. It will be truly mortifying, if, after the earnest calls of the community for the improvement of the common schools, this earnest attempt to effect such an improvement, shall be viewed with indifference, treated with contempt, or, above all, opposed as a design to lord it over them.[7]

The new law passed in 1827 met, in part, the objections of the districts by providing that the town should choose for each district a prudential committeeman who should have authority to select and employ a teacher. The teacher, however, must be examined and certified by the town school committee. This concession to the districts weakened the provision of the law passed the previous year, but appears to have been necessary to insure obedience on the part of the towns and districts.

There were two other features of the Law of 1827 which call for careful reading; for they were the legal foundation upon which Horace Mann stood when the tides of controversy surged

[7] *Mass. Archives,* Acts 1826, chap. 143, H.R. No. 29.

about him. One was a provision for moral instruction first passed in 1789[8] and now reënacted:

It shall be, and it hereby is, made the duty of the President, Professors, and Tutors, of the University at Cambridge, and of the several Colleges in this Commonwealth, Preceptors and Teachers of Academies, and all other Instructors of Youth, to take diligent care, and to exert their best endeavors to impress on the minds of children, and youth, committed to their care and instruction, the principles of piety, justice, and sacred regard to truth, love to their country, humanity, and universal benevolence, sobriety, industry, and frugality, chastity, moderation, and temperance, and those other virtues, which are the ornament of human society, and the basis upon which the Republican Constitution is founded. And it shall be the duty of such Instructors, to endeavor to lead those under their care, as their ages and capacities will admit, into a particular understanding of the tendency of the above mentioned virtues, to preserve and perfect a Republican Constitution, and to secure the blessings of Liberty, as well as to promote their future happiness, and the tendency of the opposite vices to slavery and ruin.[9]

The second feature was in the form of an amendment to that section of the Law of 1826 which directed the town school committee to select the textbooks to be used in all the schools of the town. The amendment reads:

Provided, also, that said committee shall never direct any school books to be purchased or used, in any of the schools under their superintendence, which are calculated to favor any particular religious sect or tenet.[10]

Unfortunately no official records of the debates in the House

[8] *Acts and Laws of Mass.,* June 25, 1789, chap. 19.

[9] *Laws of Mass.,* chap. 143, sec. 3, March 10, 1827. This law is referred to by some writers as the Law of 1826 and by others as the Law of 1827. This confusion is due to the fact that the legislative year began with the session which commenced May 31, 1826, and ended March 10, 1827, while the laws passed during this period are numbered by chapters from 1 to 145. Thus the law to which we have just referred was passed March 10, 1827, but is chap. 143 of the laws of 1826. For the sake of clearness, I shall uniformly refer to it as the Law of 1827, but shall copy all quotations exactly.

[10] *Laws of Mass.,* March 10, 1827, chap. 143, sec. 7.

and Senate in Massachusetts were kept during this period. The Journal of the House merely records the readings and final passage of the bill. The report of the Committee on Education above referred to merely observes that an addition has been made to the section. Newspaper comment on the whole measure is very brief. One searches in vain through the newspapers of the day for any word of opposition to this amendment. In the Worcester *National Aegis* for February 21, 1827, we read that the "School Bill" has been discussed for two days and seems to excite a good deal of interest. The article, which is a letter from a Boston correspondent, continues: "Mr. Burnside seems to be father of the bill and defends its provisions manfully and ardently." S. M. Burnside was a member of the House from Worcester. In the issue of the *Aegis* for February 28, the correspondent writes:

> The School Law, as it is called . . . does not materially vary the principles of the old laws, but being a good codification of them, it will be found an useful and convenient law—The amendments which were offered to it were too numerous to mention. Every member seemed to have some peculiar notion about Schools, and not a few drew the arguments they used from the practice of their own towns.

None of these amendments appears in the Journal of the House, and we should thus be left in ignorance of the reasons for the passage of the amendment forbidding the introduction of sectarian school books, had it not been for an attack made on the Board of Education seventeen years later. The author of this attack claimed that the Law of 1827 had been passed to exclude the teaching of "ecclesiastical systems of church government and discipline,"[11] and not the teaching of the doctrines held by the Orthodox churches. This statement was answered

[11] *The Common School Controversy; consisting of Three Letters of the Secretary of the Board of Education, of the State of Massachusetts, in reply to Charges Preferred against the Board, by the Editor of the Christian Witness and by Edward A. Newton, Esq., of Pittsfield, Once a Member of the Board; to which are added Extracts from the Daily Press, in regard to the Controversy*, p. 22.

by Mr. Burnside. We quote from his letter, which first appeared in the Worcester *Aegis*. It is dated June 4, 1844.[12]

The article abounds in errors, and wrong statements, the result, I would charitably hope, of mere inadvertence, for I can hardly believe that a man of his intelligence, and experience in public affairs, can be ignorant on the subject upon which he writes. One of his errors, more important than all the others, I feel myself able to correct, from personal knowledge; and to this one error want of time compels me principally to confine myself. I deem it but common justice to you and the public, that I should do this, although it is far from my purpose to become a party to any controversy. Mr. Newton quotes the 23d section[13] of the school law, as it stands in the Revised Statutes, passed in the winter session of 1827—viz.—"The school committees shall never direct to be purchased or used, in any of the town schools, any school books which are calculated to favor the tenets of any particular sect of Christians," and adds, "No one thought much of this enactment, until the establishment of the Board of Education, ten years afterward. It was not construed to mean the excluding of religious teaching in the great doctrines of the gospel; this had given no offence for two hundred years to the religious denominations making together the great body of the people; it was interpreted to mean, if to be operative, the exclusion of ecclesiastical systems of church government and discipline, but as these had never been obtruded so as to disturb the public repose, no danger was apprehended from them, and religious teaching, as here understood, continued to be practised in our schools."

Now, sir, it happened to me to take some part in the passage of that Act. I was a member of the Legislature of 1826-7, and was a member of the Standing Committee of the House on the Judiciary.

I attended, however, the meetings of the Committee on Education, as regularly as any of its members, for I entered the Legislature, feeling more interest in our common schools, than in the deliberations of the committee to which I belonged. I had hoped to be appointed on the Committee on Education, but the Speaker having assigned me a different place, I was kindly invited to aid them in the discharge of their

[12] *The Common School Controversy*, pp. 48-50.

[13] The 23d section of the school law in chap. 23 of the *Revised Statutes* of 1835 was the provision against the use of sectarian schoolbooks contained in the 7th section of the Law of 1827, which we have quoted on p. 22.

duties. At their request, I drew the bill almost in the very words, in which the law stands expressed. I think it did not vary in any essential point. The section in question stands in its exact original language. At their request, I explained and defended its principles, with their aid, on its passage through the House; and my own solicitude for its success led me to watch its progress through the Senate. I have not at hand the names of the gentlemen who composed the committee, but I well remember that Oliver Holden, Esq., whom I had long known before, was an active laborer and devoted member. He might well be called ultra orthodox, and I think a majority of the committee were in that connection, but of this I am not confident. But, on no occasion when I was present, did a single word fall from the lips of any one indicating the christian sect to which he belonged. The bill was cordially and unanimously approved by them, reported to the House, where it underwent a discussion of several days, and finally passed, almost if not quite unanimously, with no, or very few, material alterations. Now, sir, if the construction Mr. Newton puts on the 23d section did not originate with him, I am quite sure that no individual of that Legislature would then have claimed the honor of its invention.

The committee did not understand that any doctrines of dogmatic theology had been taught in our schools for many years—they were all of opinion that such doctrines ought to be excluded—that our schools could not otherwise be sustained—that the school room should never become the battle ground of polemic combatants—they considered the 18th article of our Bill of Rights[14] as limiting the extent of the religious instruction to be given in our schools—and the 7th section[15] of the bill was intended to conform to it.

Then the 23d section of the bill was deemed necessary, and was introduced only to limit, or rather to accommodate, the books to be used, in their moral and religious character, in the topics of instruction

[14] The 18th article in the Declaration of Rights reads: "A frequent recurrence to the fundamental principles of the Constitution, and a constant adherence to those of piety, justice, moderation, temperance, industry and frugality, are absolutely necessary to preserve the advantages of liberty, and to maintain a free government. The people ought, consequently, to have a particular attention to all those principles, in the choice of their officers and Representatives; and they have a right to require of their lawgivers and magistrates, an exact and constant observance of them, in the formation and execution of the laws necessary for the good administration of the Commonwealth."

[15] The 7th section of the school law in chap. 23 of the *Revised Statutes* of 1835 was the 3d section of the Law of 1827, which we have quoted on p. 22.

required by the 7th section:—for upon the ground presented by the section it was believed all sects of christians might walk harmoniously together—and that children and youth would be well fitted, by such instruction, to judge for themselves, in after life, what system of disputed doctrines was best entitled to belief. The idea of Mr. Newton that the 23d section was "intended to mean the exclusion of ecclesiastical systems of church government and discipline," is without foundation—such a notion, I am sure, never once entered the mind of any individual of the committee, or of either branch of the Legislature. I know the bill was universally understood as excluding doctrinal subjects of dogmatic theology, and that no other portion of it met with so much favor as this. Not a word was uttered against it. It was not considered as altering the system of popular instruction, but as legalizing it, as it was understood to exist; for, as I before said, it was not believed that controverted doctrines were then taught, certainly not, where they were objected to.

I take pleasure in saying that Hon. Emery Washburn, a distinguished professional gentleman of this place, was also a member of the House of Representatives in 1826-7. He manifested then, as he has ever since, a deep interest in popular education, took a leading part in the discussions which arose upon the passage of this bill, and brought to its support all the energies of his mind, and the powers of his eloquence, and of him, it might be said, "non fuit ullus amplior." Mr. Washburn was then, and still is, attached to the orthodox denomination. I am authorized by him to say, his recollection of the origin, progress, principles, construction and final passage of the bill, agrees with mine, as I have here stated it.

Nor is the suggestion true, of Mr. N., that "religious teaching" continued to be practised. Ever since the passage of the law, I have been intimately acquainted with the schools in this town—and, excepting a few years, have been always a somewhat active member of the town committee and of our central board of overseers. These committees and boards have embraced all the Protestant clergymen of the place except the Methodist (who never tarry long enough with us, to render us the aid they otherwise would), viz:—Orthodox, Baptist, and Unitarian. Their action has been perfectly and uniformly harmonious. On the one hand, they have required teachers to give religious instruction, within the meaning of the constitution and the statutes—but have enjoined them, on the other hand, to abstain from doctrines, which occasion strife.

In the decision of the Committee on Education to include the amendment forbidding the use of sectarian textbooks, as reported by Mr. Burnside, we thus hear an echo of the Dedham Case, the Unitarian schism, and the fierce doctrinal controversies which were still being waged in 1827. We saw that the Dedham decision confirmed the authority given to the parish by the Bill of Rights to choose the minister even if that choice were opposed by the members of the church. In the deliberations of the Committee on Education, when the provision regarding uniform textbooks to be selected by the town school committee for all the districts in the town was under consideration, it would be quite natural for someone to ask what was there to prevent a school committee, the majority of whom might be of some particular faith, from choosing schoolbooks which would inculcate their own particular doctrines. Against the disastrous results of such an action, the framers of the new law, the majority of whom Mr. Burnside believed were Orthodox, inserted the amendment.

Whether or not a suggestion made by the editor of the *New York Observer* in 1838,[16] that the law was passed to prevent the teaching of Unitarian doctrines; whether or not the Orthodox portion of the community feared such an encroachment—these are not questions of great importance. There is not the slightest evidence to show that the Unitarians had any such designs. The editorial columns of their organ, the *Christian Examiner,* are as silent on the passage of the amendment as are those of that stronghold of Orthodoxy, the *Boston Recorder.* Indeed, the opposite would seem to be true; for throughout the attacks subsequently waged against the Law of 1827 and the Board of Education and Horace Mann, the Unitarians stood squarely behind the principle of the exclusion of all sectarian teachings from the schools.

The fact of utmost importance to our study, however, is that

[16] *New York Observer,* August 18, 1838.

the Law of 1827, with its provisions for the teaching of religion and morality, while avoiding sectarianism in the schoolbooks, was drawn up and defended by a committee, a majority of whom were believed to be Orthodox; and that, moreover, the law was passed by a very large majority as expressing the desire of the citizens of the whole Commonwealth, Orthodox and Unitarians alike, that the religious controversies then raging in the churches should not invade the common schools. In 1835, when the Statutes were revised under the supervision of Horace Mann and Theron Metcalf, the provisions of the Law of 1827 regarding the teaching of religion in the schools, and the exclusion of sectarianism, were retained with slight changes in the wording which did not in any wise alter the meaning.[17] Eight years under this law had brought no cause for its abandonment. Why its administration under the Board of Education and their Secretary, whose offices were soon to be created by the Law of 1837, should have been the occasion of so much opposition is one of the major questions of this study.

After the passage of the Law of 1827, agitation in favor of improving the schools was continued year after year. Carter petitioned the legislature in 1827 for aid in establishing a seminary for training teachers, and the measure was lost in the Senate by one vote.[18]

In 1830 the American Institute of Instruction[19] was organized by teachers and others who were interested in the betterment of the schools. President Francis Wayland of Brown University was elected the first president, and George B. Emerson[20] of Boston was chosen secretary. For many years afterward Mr.

[17] *Revised Statutes of 1835*, chap. 23, secs. 7 and 23.

[18] Barnard, *op. cit.*, pp. 190 ff. The petition and the report of the select committee to whom it was referred are printed in full by Barnard.

[19] *American Journal of Education* (ed. by Henry Barnard), II, 19.

[20] Barnard, *op. cit.*, pp. 333 ff. George B. Emerson was the first principal of the first English High School in the United States, the English Classical School established in Boston in 1821. This school later came to be called the English High School.

Emerson served as president, and on many occasions he gave his aid to Horace Mann in the common cause of education. This organization did much to diffuse information in regard to education and to mold public opinion in favor of better legislation for the common schools.

In 1834 a law[21] was passed creating a school fund. The law provided that all moneys which should be in the treasury on January 1, 1835, received from the sale of lands owned by Massachusetts in the state of Maine and from the "Massachusetts Claim" against the United States Government for services of the Massachusetts militia during the War of 1812, and not otherwise appropriated, together with one-half of all funds to be received from the future sales of lands in Maine, should be used to form a permanent school fund. The fund was first limited to one million dollars, but in 1854 the legislature placed the limit at two million dollars.[22] The Law of 1834 directed that distribution of the income from the fund to the towns was to be made upon two conditions: first, the towns must raise by taxation for schools at least one dollar for each child from four to sixteen years of age; and in the second place, every town school committee must make an annual statistical report to the Secretary of State, on a form prescribed by law, giving information which would aid in framing useful legislation for the improvement of the schools. This provision for the "school returns," as the reports were called, was of great service to Horace Mann when he began his work as Secretary of the Board of Education three years later.

In 1836 the American Institute of Instruction[23] memorialized the legislature and urged the passage of legislation to provide for the training of teachers. The memorial was drawn up by

[21] *Laws of Mass.*, March 31, 1834, chap. 169.

[22] Charles J. Bullock, *Historical Sketch of the Finances and Financial Policy of Massachusetts, from 1780 to 1905*, p. 37. See also *Twenty-second Annual Report of the Mass. Board of Education*, pp. 38-53.

[23] Barnard, *op. cit.*, p. 339.

George B. Emerson, chairman of the committee appointed by the Institute for that purpose. The memorial was referred to a committee, but no legislation was passed. In 1837 Governor Edward Everett,[24] in his opening address to the legislature, recommended the creation of a "board of commissioners of schools." His recommendation was referred to the Committee on Education, and a bill in keeping with it, drawn up by James G. Carter[25] as chairman of the committee for the House, was reported. After a good deal of opposition,[26] the measure was passed and became a law April 20, 1837.[27]

The provisions of the law were simple; there were four brief sections. The first provided that the governor and council should appoint a board of eight members, who, with the governor and lieutenant-governor as members *ex officiis*, should compose the Board of Education. The term of office was eight years; one member was to retire each year in order of appointment, and a new member should be added. The second section directed the Board to prepare and present to the legislature annually an abstract of the school returns received by the Secretary of State from the towns, and also gave permission to appoint a secretary, whose duties under the Board's direction should be to "collect information of the actual condition and efficiency of the Common Schools, and other means of popular education, and diffuse as widely as possible throughout every part of the Commonwealth, information of the most approved and successful methods of arranging the studies, and conducting the education

[24] His message is printed in the *Resolves of Massachusetts for 1837*, pp. 465 ff. For an estimate of Everett's influence on the educational movement see Paul Revere Frothingham, *Edward Everett, Orator and Statesman*, pp. 135-139.

[25] Barnard, *op. cit.*, p. 191.

[26] The House first defeated the bill by a vote of 113 to 61, but Carter succeeded in getting the House to go into a committee of the whole, and reconsider the measure. The result was a victory for the friends of education. See also George H. Martin, *The Evolution of the Massachusetts Public School System*, p. 155.

[27] *Laws of Mass.*, April 20, 1837, chap. 241.

of the young, to the end that all children in this Commonwealth, who depend upon Common Schools for instruction, may have the best education which those schools can be made to impart." The third section required the Board to make annually "a detailed report to the legislature of all its doings," with suggestions for improving the system of popular education. The fourth section empowered the governor to draw warrants for the Secretary's salary. Neither the Board nor the Secretary were granted powers of compulsion. Their influence could be only that which they might exert in their advisory capacity while investigating conditions, exposing defects, and recommending improvements.

The members of the first Board of Education were chosen with the utmost care. Seven years later, when answering a criticism which had been brought against the policies of the Board, Mr. Mann stated the principles which had been followed in their selection:

> Various considerations should enter, and did enter into the appointment of the Board. I may speak with confidence here, for I had personal knowledge of the facts. All the great parties, into which the State was divided, were to be regarded. Religious views were among the most important. Political considerations could not be overlooked. Indications of public sentiment, in regard to men, whom the people had invested with office for a long course of years, were also worthy of attention. Even local residence, though among the weakest motives, must not be wholly forgotten. Having regard, *in all cases,* to a general fitness for the office, I submit to a candid public, whether the above considerations were not the proper criteria in making the selections.[28]

Guided by these considerations, the selection of the members of the Board was as follows:[29]

> Governor Edward Everett, Chairman *ex officio,* Whig and Unitarian.

[28] *The Common School Controversy,* p. 27.

[29] I list the names of the members in the order of their appointment as recorded in the manuscript minutes of the meetings of the Board. These minutes are in the files of the Department of Education, State House, Boston. Hereafter they will be referred to as "Minutes."

Lieutenant-Governor George Hull, member, *ex officio*, Whig and Unitarian.

James G. Carter, Chairman of the House Committee on Education, Whig and Unitarian.

Rev. Emerson Davis, of Westfield, Whig and pastor of the Congregational Church (Trinitarian) in Westfield.

Edmund Dwight, of Boston, Whig and Unitarian, wealthy merchant and friend of the educational movement.

Horace Mann, President of the Massachusetts Senate, Whig and Unitarian. When Mr. Mann resigned to become Secretary of the Board of Education, his place on the Board was filled by Rev. George Putnam, of Roxbury, Whig and pastor of the First Church (Unitarian) in Roxbury.

Edward A. Newton, of Pittsfield, a prominent Whig in Pittsfield and an Episcopalian.

Robert Rantoul, Jr., of Gloucester, a leading Democrat in the legislature, and a Unitarian.

Rev. Thomas Robbins, of Rochester, Whig and pastor of the Congregational Church (Trinitarian) in Mattapoisett village in the town of Rochester.

Rev. Jared Sparks, Whig and Unitarian, President of Harvard University.

At the first meeting of the Board, which was held on the morning of June 29, 1837, Horace Mann was chosen Secretary of the Board. The wisdom of this choice was soon to be seen. Horace Mann was eminently qualified for the new task. A graduate of Brown University, where he had been valedictorian of his class,[30] he had been called back to serve as tutor for two years, after which he entered the famous law school of Judge Gould at Litchfield, Connecticut. He was admitted to the Norfolk bar in 1823,[31] and opened an office in Dedham. His brilliant

[30] The manuscript copy of his address delivered at Commencement, September 1, 1818, is among the "Mann Papers." The subject is, "The Gradual Advancement of the Human Species in Dignity and Happiness."

[31] *Life of Horace Mann*, by his wife, New Edition, pp. 32 ff. This volume was published by Mrs. Mary Mann in 1865 and constitutes vol. I of the *Life and Works of Horace Mann*, in five volumes. Hereafter I shall refer to vol. I as the *Life*.

mental powers, combined with his inflexible rule never to take a case which he did not believe to be right, soon won for him a reputation for ability and honesty, and he rose rapidly in his profession. He had been chosen representative from Dedham in 1827, and had begun his career in the legislature with the opening of the next session after that which had passed the school law of 1827, with its clause forbidding the use of sectarian schoolbooks.[32] Removing to Boston[33] in 1833, he was soon elected senator from Suffolk, and in 1836, and again in 1837, had been chosen president of the Senate. In 1835 he had assisted in revising the statute laws of the Commonwealth.

Throughout his public career Mr. Mann had taken a lively interest in every reform movement for the betterment of his fellow men. He had advocated legislation for better schools and had been an active leader in the temperance reform. But he was best known for his outstanding leadership in the movement which brought about legislation in 1830, establishing the State Hospital for the Insane at Worcester.[34] After the buildings were erected in 1833, he was made chairman of the Board of Trustees which had supervision of the institution.[35]

[32] Sherman M. Smith in his book, *The Relation of the State to Religious Education in Massachusetts,* which has come into my hands since the above was written, says, "Doubtless Unitarians favored the bill, as we know that Horace Mann was then in the legislature and worked for it" (p. 97). This statement is incorrect. The law was passed March 10, 1827. Mann began his duties in the legislature with the session which began May 30, 1827 (*Resolves of Mass., 1824-1828,* pp. 569, 573). He was elected in town meeting, May 7, 1827 (*Mass. Archives*).

[33] His removal to Boston was brought about by friends who feared that his grief, occasioned by his wife's death in 1832, would soon cut short his usefulness unless he could be induced to leave the scenes associated with her memory. In 1830 Horace Mann had married Charlotte Messer, daughter of President Asa Messer of Brown University. Her death while he was watching by her side in the night cast a deep shadow over his life which was never entirely dispelled. Entries in his Journal written on each recurring anniversary of her death for many years reveal a life crushed by sorrow. See also *Life,* pp. 35-40.

[34] *Resolves of Mass.,* 1830, chap. 83.

[35] Barnard, *op. cit.,* pp. 370-373. A sketch of Mann's speech supporting the resolve for establishing the hospital is given by Mr. Barnard on pp. 371, 372.

Horace Mann's election to the secretaryship of the Board of Education was due chiefly to the efforts of Mr. Edmund Dwight, who had repeatedly interviewed him and urged him to accept the office. Several selections from Mr. Mann's Journal, written down at this time, show his surprise when Mr. Dwight first suggested the subject to him, and also reveal the motives which finally led him to enter the new field in which he was destined to render outstanding service to Massachusetts and to the world. On May 6, he wrote:

Dined today with Edmund Dwight, Esq., for the purpose of conferring with him on the late law authorizing the appointment of a Board of Education. Mr. Dwight had the civility, or the incivility (I do not doubt that his *motives* would place the act under the former category), to propose that *I* should be Secretary of the Board,—a most responsible and important office, bearing more effectually, if well executed, upon the coming welfare of the State, than any other office in it. For myself, I never had a sleeping nor a waking dream that I should ever think of myself, or be thought of by any other, in relation to that station.

On May 18, he wrote the following:

Spent this evening with Mr. Dwight, who showed me a letter from the Governor, proposing my nomination, with his, as a member of the Board of Education, provided for by a law of the last session. Mr. Dwight again urged upon me a consideration of the subject of my being Secretary of the Board. Ought I to think of filling this high and responsible office? Can I adequately perform its duties? Will my greater zeal in the cause than that of others supply the deficiency in point of talent and information?

Another entry, written June 14, shows the direction in which his mind was moving, and we read:

All the leisure of this day has been spent in writing a long letter to E. Dwight, Esq., at his request, portraying the duties of the Secretary of the Board of Education, and informing him of the relation in which I must stand to his proposition to me to accept that office. I cannot think of that station, as regards myself, without feeling both hopes

and fears, desires and apprehensions, multiplying in my mind,—so glorious a sphere, should it be crowned with success; so heavy with disappointment and humiliation, should it fail through any avoidable misfortune. What a thought, to have the future minds of such multitudes dependent in any perceptible degree upon one's own exertions! It is such a thought as must mightily energize or totally overpower any mind that can adequately comprehend it.

By June 28, the day before the date appointed for the first meeting of the Board, he had made his decision and wrote in the Journal:

I tremble . . . at the idea of the task that possibly now lies before me. Yet I can now conscientiously say that here stands my purpose, ready to undergo the hardships and privations to which I must be subjected, and to encounter the jealousy, the misrepresentation, and the prejudice almost certain to arise; here stands my mind, ready to meet them in the spirit of a martyr. To-morrow will probably prescribe for me a course of life. Let it come! I know one thing,—if I stand by the principles of truth and duty, nothing can inflict upon me any permanent harm.

On the following day the office was formally offered to him, and the entry reads:

I cannot say that this day is one to which I have not looked forward with deep anxiety. The chance of being offered a station which would change the whole course of my action, and consequently of my duties, through life, was not to be regarded with indifference. The deep feeling of interest was heightened by the reflection, that, in case of my receiving the appointment of Secretary of the Board of Education, my sphere of *possible* usefulness would be indefinitely enlarged, and that my failure would forever force into contrast the noble duty and the inadequate discharge of it. The day is past. I have received the offer. The path of usefulness is opened before me. My present purpose is to enter into it. Few undertakings, according to my appreciation of it, have been greater. I know of none which may be more fruitful in beneficent results.

God grant me an annihilation of selfishness, a mind of wisdom, a heart of benevolence! How many men I shall meet who are accessible only through a single motive, or who are incased in prejudice and

jealousy, and need, not to be subdued, but to be remodelled! how many who will vociferate their devotion to the public, but whose thoughts will be intent on themselves! There is but one spirit in which these impediments can be met with success: it is the spirit of self-abandonment, the spirit of martyrdom. . . . In all this, there must be a higher object than to win personal esteem, or favor, or worldly applause. A new fountain may now be opened. Let me strive to direct its current in such a manner, that if, when I have departed from life, I may still be permitted to witness its course, I may behold it broadening and deepening in an everlasting progression of virtue and happiness.

Mann's acceptance was communicated to the Board on June 30. The following is an extract from an entry in his Journal on that date:

Henceforth, so long as I hold this office, I devote myself to the supremest welfare of mankind upon earth. An inconceivably greater labor is undertaken. With the highest degree of prosperity, results will manifest themselves but slowly. The harvest is far distant from the seed-time. *Faith* is the only sustainer. I have faith in the improvability of the race,—in their accelerating improvability. This effort may do, apparently, but little. But mere beginning in a good cause is never little. If we can get this vast wheel into any perceptible motion, we shall have accomplished much. And more and higher qualities than mere labor and perseverance will be requisite. Art for applying will be no less necessary than science for combining and deducing. No object ever gave scope for higher powers, or exacted a more careful, sagacious use of them. At first, it will be better to err on the side of caution than of boldness. When walking over quagmires, we should never venture long steps. However, after all the advice which all the sages who ever lived could give, there is no such security against danger, and in favor of success, as to undertake it with a right spirit,—with a self-sacrificing spirit. Men can resist the influence of talent; they will deny demonstration, if need be: but few will combat goodness for any length of time. A spirit mildly devoting itself to a good cause is a certain conqueror. Love is a universal solvent. Wilfulness will maintain itself against persecution, torture, death, but will be fused and dissipated by kindness, forbearance, sympathy. Here is a clew given by God to lead us through the labyrinth of the world.

These extended quotations from Horace Mann's own words suggest the motives and the character of the man who was soon to be the object of criticism and attack. Here was a man who was turning aside from a brilliant career which had already brought marked distinction at the age of forty-one,[36] humble, eager to be of service to his fellow men, yet uncertain of his fitness for the great task toward which he was setting his face. There is nothing of meanness here, nothing of the insincerity of purpose implied in his enemies' charges which we are presently to examine. Rather is there moral earnestness, and a high devotion to what was conceived to be a great cause. He believed supremely in the value of universal education. He believed in the "accelerating improvability" of the race. But it must be observed that there is in all of his meditations a suggestion of an unhealthy introspection. Twice he speaks of martyrdom. He expects to be misunderstood and opposed. Whom did he fear? We shall do well to take account of this attitude of mind as we trace the record of events and note Mann's interpretation of the opposition brought by his Orthodox opponents.

Mann immediately took steps to finish his professional business already begun, and to close his law office. On July 2, he wrote to a friend:

> My law-books are for sale. My office is "to let." The bar is no longer my forum. My jurisdiction is changed. I have abandoned jurisprudence, and betaken myself to the larger sphere of mind and morals.[37]

He resolved to give his entire time and energy to the work of education. He therefore declined reëlection to the Senate and—though not without regret—severed his connections with the various temperance organizations[38] in which he had been a leader. Henry Barnard[39] says that Mann never attended a political caucus or convention of any kind during his twelve years in

[36] Mann was born in Franklin, Massachusetts, May 4, 1796 (*Life*, p. 9).
[37] *Life*, p. 82. [38] *Ibid.*, pp. 69, 71, 72. [39] Barnard, *op. cit.*, p. 374.

the secretaryship. Though his sympathies with reform movements were as strong as ever, he foresaw that the success of the great cause depended upon the complete avoidance of partisanship of every description.

Many of his friends were unable to understand Mann's decision. There is a note of loneliness in the entry in his Journal written July 3:

> What strikes me as most extraordinary in relation to my new office is, that every man, with the single exception of Dr. Channing,[40] inquires concerning the *salary,* or makes remarks that look wholly to the comparative *honor* of the station; while no man seems to recognize its possible usefulness, or the dignity and elevation which is inwrought into beneficent action. Does not the community need to be educated half round the compass, until they shall cease to look upon that as the greatest good which is the smallest, and shall find the greatest good in what they now overlook, and by which their minds pass as unconsciously as though it had no existence?

A few days later, when an acquaintance had expressed regret that the title did not sufficiently indicate the dignity of the office and the duties to be performed, he wrote:

> If the Lord prospers me in this great work, I hope to convict such persons of error; and as to the title, of what consequence is that? If the title is not sufficiently honorable now, then it is clearly left for me to elevate it; and I had rather be creditor than debtor to the title.

Horace Mann entered upon his work at once with characteristic energy and enthusiasm. The entries in his Journal show how congenial to his interests he found the new subject to be. He read the works of several writers on education, and began to examine school apparatus with a view to introducing its use into the schools. We have noted that the Law of 1837 directed

[40] A letter from Channing, written a few weeks later, is in the *Memoir of William Ellery Channing, with Extracts from his Correspondence and Manuscripts,* III, 89. This letter is also in Henry Barnard's *American Educational Biography,* p. 374.

that the Secretary should gather information regarding actual conditions in the schools, and should carry to the people throughout the state suggestions for their improvement. As his plans developed, four principal lines of work emerged. In the first place, a series of conventions in all of the counties in the state were held annually, to which were invited teachers, school committees, and all others interested in education. In most of the counties permanent organizations known as county associations were established. Mann's lectures[41] delivered from year to year in the county conventions, together with many occasional lectures and addresses, exerted a strong influence in awakening an indifferent public to the needs and the possibilities existing in the common schools.

Mr. Mann's second method of work was by means of his annual reports, and the abstracts of the school returns. It will be remembered that every town was required by the Law of 1834 to make a statistical report to the Secretary of State as one of the conditions of receiving the benefits of the School Fund. In Mann's hands the abstracts of these school returns, which he prepared annually, were made a powerful instrument for revealing to the public the defects existing in the schools.

With the *Abstract of the School Returns,* Mr. Mann also presented an annual *Report to the Board of Education.* His twelve annual *Reports,* with the *Supplementary Report on Schoolhouses,* have become classics and are generally acknowledged to be the most important of his educational writings. Dr. B. A. Hinsdale[42] reminds us that though they were nominally made to the Board of Education, they were really addressed to the people of Massachusetts and to the whole country. Their influence in their day, and upon the educational movement since, would be difficult to estimate.[43]

[41] Seven lectures are printed in *The Life and Works of Horace Mann,* vol. II.

[42] B. A. Hinsdale, *Horace Mann, and the Common School Revival in the United States,* p. 162. Hinsdale gives a good, brief review of each of the twelve Reports in the seventh chapter.

[43] In 1844, George B. Emerson wrote: "Such Reports upon the subject of

A third means was created in the form of the *Common School Journal,* a magazine edited by Mr. Mann and published semi-monthly as a private enterprise. In the first issue, which appeared in November, 1838, the editor stated that it would be the policy of the paper to avoid partisanship in politics and sectarianism in religion. The magazine was continued for ten years and was an important factor in molding public opinion. All of Mann's annual *Reports* to the Board excepting the last were published in it, as were many other valuable articles.

The fourth phase of Mr. Mann's plan of work is seen in the development of the normal schools under his guidance. We shall have occasion presently to examine in detail the steps by which they were established, and therefore will not discuss them at this point. The pressing need for a means of training teachers had long been urged by James G. Carter and others. The idea of developing normal schools was not new with Mann. In this, as in much else that he did in the field of education, he entered into the labor of others. But the success with which the project was carried through must be credited to his wisdom and statesmanship.

education have never before been made. Such an impulse to the cause has never before been given. The pages of the Secretary are luminous with the noblest truths, and cheerful with the warmest and most hopeful philanthropy. The great truths which he has proclaimed, and will continue to proclaim, have already reached far beyond the limits of our narrow State. They are echoing in the woods of Maine, and along the St. Lawrence and the Lakes. They are heard throughout New York, and throughout all the West and the South West. A conviction of their importance has sent a Massachusetts man to take charge of the schools of New Orleans; they are at this moment regenerating those of Rhode Island. In the remotest corner of Ohio, forty men, not children and women, but *men,* meet together to read aloud a single copy of the Secretary's Reports which one of them receives; thousands of the best friends of humanity of all sects, parties, and creeds, in every State of the Union, are familiar with the name of Horace Mann . . ."—*Observations on a Pamphlet, entitled "Remarks on the Seventh Annual Report of the Hon. Horace Mann, Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education,"* p. 15.

CHAPTER IV

The Massachusetts School Library

ON January 1, 1838, Horace Mann read his *First Report* to the Board of Education. In his Journal of that date he records the event and says he has been "in the deep water of fidgets ever since," because of uncertainty as to the manner of impression made upon their minds. Near the end of the Report, after pointing out the evils of private schools, and the need of teachers competent to train pupils in morality in accordance with the requirements of the law, he calls attention to what he considers the serious lack of textbooks on morality and religion. The paragraph was soon to be singled out for attack. Its bearing on the later development of the controversies between Mr. Mann and the religious sectaries is so important as to justify an extensive quotation:

In regard to moral instruction, the condition of our public schools presents a singular, and, to some extent at least, an alarming phenomenon. To prevent the school from being converted into an engine of religious proselytism; to debar successive teachers in the same school, from successively inculcating hostile religious creeds, until the children in their simple-mindedness should be alienated, not only from creeds, but from religion itself; the statute of 1826[1] specially provided, that no school books should be used in any of the public schools "calculated to favor any particular religious sect or tenet." The language of the Revised Statutes is slightly altered, but the sense remains the same. Probably, no one would desire a repeal of this law, while the danger impends it was designed to repel. The consequence of the enactment, however, has been, that among the vast libraries of books, expository of the doctrines of revealed religion, none have been found free from that advocacy of particular "tenets" or "sects," which includes them within the scope of the legal prohibition; or, at least, no such books have been approved by the committees and intro-

[1] See p. 22, note.

duced into the schools. Independently, therefore, of the immeasurable importance of moral teaching in itself considered, this entire exclusion of religious teaching, though justifiable under the circumstances, enhances and magnifies a thousand fold, the indispensableness of moral instruction and training. Entirely to discard the inculcation of the great doctrines of morality and of natural theology has a vehement tendency to drive mankind into opposite extremes; to make them devotees on one side, or profligates on the other; each about equally regardless of the true constituents of human welfare. Against a tendency to these fatal extremes, the beautiful and sublime truths of ethics and of natural religion have a poising power. Hence it will be learned with sorrow, that of the multiplicity of books used in our schools, only three have this object in view; and these three are used in only *six* of the two thousand nine hundred and eighteen schools, from which returns have been received.[2]

A few pages further on he continues:

One of the greatest and most exigent wants of our schools at the present time, is a book, portraying, with attractive illustration and with a simplicity adapted to the simplicity of childhood, the obligations arising from social relationships; making them stand out, with the altitude of mountains, above the level of the engrossments of life; —not a book written for the copy right's sake, but one emanating from some comprehension of the benefits of supplying children, at an early age, with simple and elementary notions of right and wrong in feeling and in conduct, so that the appetites and passions, as they spring up in the mind, may, by a natural process, be conformed to the principles, instead of the principles being made to conform to the passions and appetites.

Mann's statement has a twofold significance. In the first place, he is calling attention to the Law of 1827 and its bearing upon the status of religious instruction in the schools in 1837. No books teaching "revealed religion," and free from sectarianism had been introduced into the schools. If any sectarian books were being used, he does not denounce the infractions.[3] He sim-

[2] *First Report*, 1838, pp. 61, 62.

[3] In the *Twelfth Report*, pp. 113, 114, Mr. Mann says that during his first educational tour of the state in 1837, he found doctrinal books and doctrinal instruction in some of the schools. See chap. XII, p. 217.

ply gives the terms of the law in a general explanatory statement. But Mann's words are significant in the second place, because he is making a plea for moral training in the schools, and at the same time urges the need for religious education. He does not say that revealed religion cannot be taught, but that the school committees have not found any books on revealed religion the use of which would not violate the Law of 1827. He therefore proposes ethics and natural religion to meet the need.

Exact definitions of religion are difficult to form, yet for our purpose we may define natural religion as the belief in God, and the reverence for him, gained from the evidences of the physical universe. Revealed religion, on the other hand, is believed to have, as its foundation, some direct revelation from the Deity to one or more human beings. By revealed religion, Horace Mann had in mind, of course, the Christian religion as revealed in Jesus Christ. Better teachers and better books are needed, he says, in order that the "alarming" absence of moral and religious training may be supplied. To meet this need in part, he asks for a book on practical ethics suited to the use of children. A further provision was soon suggested in the form of the Massachusetts School Library.

By the Law of April 12, 1837,[4] the legislature had authorized the districts to raise by taxation and expend for school libraries thirty dollars for the first year and ten dollars for each succeeding year. Few if any of the districts had availed themselves of the provisions of this law when the first Reports of the Board and the Secretary were submitted to the Legislature and published for distribution throughout the state. The Board called attention to the desirability of establishing a library in each district, but deemed it wise to leave the publishing of books to private enterprise rather than to attempt to prepare a series of volumes for distribution at public expense.[5]

At the annual meeting of the Board, January 31, 1838, Mann

[4] *Laws of Mass.*, April 12, 1837, chap. 147.

[5] *First Report*, pp. 13 ff.

proposed that selection be made of books for a library which the Board could recommend to the committees in the various districts. The minutes of the Board state that he suggested that a commission be appointed

> . . . to examine all books which should be deemed proper for said Libraries, & if nothing in said books should be found unacceptable to any member of said commission—(which commission it was proposed should represent the cardinal & fundamental differences on religious & political subjects) that then the members of said commission should give to such unobjectionable book the sanction of their unanimous approval,—the object being to remove from the minds of persons, not acquainted with the contents of the books, all apprehension of their containing such sectarian or partisan views as would render them obnoxious. Whereupon it was voted that Mr. Sparks should make enquiry of Book sellers respecting the terms on which they would print & supply sets of books for District School Libraries.

On April 18, 1838, at the next meeting of the Board, President Sparks made a verbal report, and the subject and estimates were referred to him and the Secretary. The following day, on Mr. Sparks' motion, it was voted:

> That considering the important benefits, that would result from the circulation of a series of well-chosen books, in the School Districts of the several towns, it is an object worthy of the countenance & encouragement of the Board:—& that,
>
> The Secretary be authorized to make an arrangement with a publisher for printing & publishing two series of books, the one to be entitled "The Massachusetts Common School Library" & the other to be entitled "The Massachusetts Primary School Library," each volume to be previously approved by every member of the Board & to be accompanied by the testimony of their approbation.
>
> That in this arrangement it be stipulated by the Secretary that the work shall be faithfully & thoroughly executed in regard to the typography, paper & binding & sold particularly to the towns and school Districts at a moderate price.
>
> That the Secretary be requested to make an agreement in writing with a publisher & present it to the Board for their approval at their next meeting.

All the members of the Board, with the exception of Mr. Newton and Dr. Robbins, were present when this action was taken. It will be remembered that both men were Orthodox, Newton an Episcopalian and Robbins a minister of an Orthodox Congregational church. Dr. Robbins approved of the plan and entered into the task of its execution. His support was most important to its success when, not many months later, it was made the object of a bitter attack.

Mr. Newton, however, strongly opposed the project, a fact more easily understood when his life and background are taken into account. He was born May 1, 1785, in Halifax, Nova Scotia, whither his father had hastened upon the evacuation of Boston by General Howe in 1776. After his father's death he had gone to Boston, in 1804. In 1816 he went to Calcutta, India, where he spent nine years as representative of the firm of Stephen Higginson and Company of Boston. Retiring with a fortune in 1825, he made his residence in Pittsfield, Massachusetts, his wife's home. For many years he was president of the Agricultural Bank of Pittsfield. He was a trustee of Williams College for nineteen years. He was an Episcopalian, and had been chief among the founders of the church of that denomination in Pittsfield. He was a Whig, and had been a presidential elector in 1836. In 1842 and 1843 he was elected a member of the executive council.[6]

Conservative and aristocratic by heredity and training, Mr. Newton's views did not readily harmonize with those of his associates on the Board in the democratic enterprise in which they were engaged. The minutes of the Board's meetings do not show that he carried a share of its work. His name does not appear on any of the subcommittees by means of which the Board conducted its work. When Mr. Mann went to Pittsfield to hold the educational convention during his first official tour of the state in 1837, he found that Newton had done almost nothing to pre-

[6] J. E. A. Smith, *History of Pittsfield, 1800 to 1876*, pp. 407 ff.

pare for the convention, and Mann was obliged to make such arrangements and create such interest as were possible upon short notice. Newton was elected president of the association organized, but Mann's comment in the privacy of his Journal shows he had little confidence that anything would be accomplished under this leadership, and concludes: "If there be no more life in the body than in the head, it will decompose very soon."

One may question whether Mr. Newton ever sympathized with the purposes of the Board. Certainly his sympathy with its plans did not grow with their development, and after retaining his membership on the Board for a year, he made the Library an occasion for his resignation. An item in the minutes of the meeting held August 31, 1838, reads:

> The Chairman communicated a letter from Mr. Newton, stating his disapproval of the proposed Plan of preparing "School District Libraries" & that he could not concur therein, & he suggested the following alternative, either the rescission by the Board of their vote of April 19, 1838, *that each volume of the Library should be previously approved by every member of the Board & be accompanied by the testimony of their approbation* or, in case the Board declined to rescind the above vote, his own intention to resign his seat as a member thereof.
>
> Whereupon said communication was referred to Messrs Davis, Robbins and Putnam.

This committee, consisting of the two remaining Orthodox members, both Trinitarian Congregational ministers, and one Unitarian minister, prepared a careful report which Dr. Davis read at the session of the Board on the following day:

> The Committee, to whom were referred a letter from Edward A. Newton, Esq., a member of the Board of Education,—of July 20, 1838,—and the consideration of the Resolutions adopted by this Board, relative to the formation of a Common School Library & the mode of selecting the books, beg leave to *Report:*—
>
> That in their opinion it is the duty of the Board to select a Library,

that may be offered to the Districts, or to cause it to be selected. It is also the opinion of the Committee that the Resolution, which requires that every book, introducted into said Library shall receive the approbation of every member of the Board, ought not to be altered. Our reasons for this opinion are the following:—

1st. The Board of Education is an Executive rather than a legislative body. It was constituted to carry out more perfectly the common school system, as it stands on the statute book. Among other legislative enactments, there is one, Chap. 23, S. 23 of the Revised Statutes, which prohibits committeemen from introducing any books, "calculated to favor the tenets of any particular sect of Christians." If the law will not allow committeemen to do it, neither will it allow it to be done by this Board. No mode of securing the public against the apprehension, that books of this character may be introduced into the Library is likely to prove so satisfactory as a unanimous recommendation by the members of the Board.

2nd. If this Board neglect to recommend a selection of books, suitable for a Library there is reason to fear that individual enterprise may offer to the Districts books, that would be objectionable.

3rd. The Board have given such assurances in regard to the Library to a publishing house in this city, that the Company have already been at an expense of several hundred dollars in preparing to publish such books as the Board may unanimously recommend.

4th. While the laws of the Commonwealth prohibit the introduction of books, that inculcate the peculiar tenets of any particular sect, it is required by the 6th & 7th Sections of the school law, above referred to, that all who have any supervision of the schools shall "exert their best endeavors to impress on the minds of children & youth"—"the principles of piety, justice," &c. While therefore, it would be unwarrantable, on the part of the Board to exert their influence to introduce into the schools of the Commonwealth any books that fall within the legal exclusion above alluded to, it is incumbent upon them on the other hand to do all in their power, within the sphere of their duties, to accomplish what the Statute requires in regard to moral instruction.

5th. While the Legislature require the children in our common schools to be taught the principles of piety & virtue, & prohibits the propogation of sectarian views, it cannot in truth be said, that the Legislature or the Board of Education are regardless of the religious instruction of the children and youth of the Commonwealth. On the contrary the facts prove that Massachusetts still retains & cherishes

the great principles of freedom, that were cherished by her puritan ancestors. By her laws she enjoins that children *shall* be taught the principles common to all sects and then wisely leaves it to parents & [to] the several denominations to complete the system each according to his own views.

All of which is respectfully submitted. E. Davis, Thomas Robbins, Geo. Putnam. Committee.

Thus the Board clearly expressed their position. They believed the Library was needed to teach morality and the principles of religion common to all sects, but in its selection they must stand upon the principles of the Law of 1827, reënacted in 1835. The method of approval adopted was the surest guarantee that the law would not be violated.

The report bears no evidence that Newton's resignation was accepted with regret. He passed from its membership to become its active enemy, as subsequent events were to prove. But it is not unlikely that Mr. Mann and the remaining members of the Board shared to a degree the satisfaction in his withdrawal expressed in the following extract from a letter written by a friend of education, a member of the school committee in Northampton:

Dec. 12, 1838. Permit me to offer you & all other true friends of the cause you have at heart, my cordial congratulations on the "*glorious*" resignation of Newton as member of your Board. His appointment was decidedly the greatest blunder our Governor has made & I trust that some pains will be taken to save him from another similar mistake. In selecting a person to fill the vacancy reference should be had quite as much to the character of the candidate's heart as to his head—especially to his social tendencies. There are many men in the country possessing sufficient intelligence for the place, who are notwithstanding by reason of their early associations, education & constitutional temperament utterly unfitted to serve in a cause so purely democratic, and which invites to labor by the hope of neither profit nor honor to the laborer—Save us from these country aristocrats. They are infinitely more mischievous & truly odious than any with which the city is cursed. . . . Saml. F. Lyman.

In contrast with the attitude of Mr. Newton, the course of Dr. Robbins is most interesting.[7] He was thoroughly loyal to his Orthodox faith. During his term of office as member of the Board of Education, he was pastor of the Orthodox Congregational church at Mattapoisett village in Rochester, Massachusetts, where he had been settled in 1831. An entry in his Diary dated May 14, 1838, is characteristic of his views:

> Afternoon rode to Bedford. . . . Went into the new Unitarian meeting-house. It is very elegant. O that the Divine Redeemer would take it into his own hands.[8]

Prior to Newton's resignation, Dr. Robbins had been appointed to the Board's standing committee on schoolbooks which was to give its attention to textbooks and books for the Library. The other members of the committee were Dr. George Putnam, a Unitarian, pastor of the First Church in Roxbury, and Horace Mann. At the Board meeting on June 1, 1838, on which date the appointments to the standing committees were recorded in the minutes, Dr. Robbins moved,

> That the Board recommend that the Bible or selections from it be used as a school book.

[7] Rev. Thomas Robbins, D.D. (1777-1856). Educated at Yale and Williams. He had taught three years (1799-1802) as principal of an academy at Danbury, Connecticut, and had spent several years in the ministry, when in 1809 he began to form a permanent library. He resolved to add to the library at least one hundred volumes each year, and invoked God's blessing on the enterprise. Dr. Robbins never married. It appears that he deliberately chose to devote his modest salary, received as the minister of a small church, to building up his library. A fellow minister said of him, "Brother Robbins thought he could have either a wife or a library, and he very unwisely chose the latter,—very unwisely." In 1844 he became librarian of the Connecticut Historical Society at Hartford, to which he gave his library which had now grown to number many thousands of volumes. Henry Barnard was largely instrumental in securing his appointment, as well as the splendid gift of his library which was deposited in the Wadsworth Atheneum at Hartford. See *Memorial Biographies of the New England Historic Genealogical Society*, III, 77 ff. See also *Diary of Thomas Robbins, D.D.* (ed. by Increase N. Tarbox, 2 vols., Boston, 1887). It contains many references to local and national events. The course by which Dr. Robbins acquired one after another of his rare old volumes may be traced, and his comments are interesting.

[8] *Diary of Thomas Robbins, D.D.*, II, 493.

This motion was referred to the committee on schoolbooks, of which he was chairman. On August 31, Robbins proposed a motion,

> That the Treasurer of the Board be directed to procure the publication of the New Testament with the book of Psalms to be recommended to the School Committees of the several Towns in the Commonwealth to be used as a reading-book in the Public Schools.

This motion was also referred to the committee on schoolbooks, and on the following day Dr. Robbins reported that action should be postponed until after the Board's decision upon the general question of recommending schoolbooks to the school committees.

The Board found the question of recommending schoolbooks a difficult one to decide. In their *First Report* they suggested that the evils resulting from the "multiplicity" and "imperfection" of textbooks might be removed by a selection and formal recommendation of books by the Board, and added:

> Such a recommendation would probably cause them to be generally adopted; but should this not prove effectual, and the evil be found to continue, it might hereafter be deemed expedient to require the use of the books thus recommended, as a condition of receiving a share of the benefit of the school fund.[9]

This was a proposal to seek for power not granted by the provisions of the Law of 1837, which created the Board of Education, and it is not surprising that twenty towns returned a negative answer when Mann inserted, in his circular sent to the school committees in 1838, the question: "Would it be generally acceptable to the friends of Education in your town to have the Board of Education recommend books for the use of the Schools?" On the other hand, ten towns were in favor of having the Board recommend but not prescribe books; two wished to have them recommend and prescribe; and one favored having

[9] *First Report*, pp. 14 ff.

the Board prescribe by an act of the legislature. Mann found that towns containing seven-eighths of the population favored having the Board recommend textbooks.[10]

The Board never adopted a policy of recommending textbooks, but it considered the Library so important that the project was continued. In the selection of the books for the Library, Dr. Robbins took an active interest. That its value as a possible means of bringing religious reading within the reach of young people was uppermost in his mind, is evident from the following letter:

Mattapoisett Village, June 6th, 38. Mr. Mann. Dear Sir. The large bundle of books which you directed to have prepared for me were duly sent to the Bromfield House & I brought them home. Many of them I think will be appropriate to our object. I have no predilections for Phrenology, apprehending that its tendency might be something Atheistical; but I have been looking over Combe's work & find it better than I expected, & have no objection to it being admitted.—As I understand it, the books which we are selecting are to be recommended for libraries for common schools, & not for the Norman [*sic*] schools. Paley & Combe & some others are highly philosophical, for such readers as we have in view, yet there may be some pupils who may have a relish for them. We hope indeed to give these schools such an elevation that youths of good families may finish their education at them.—But I have something further to say on this subject. A great portion of the reading community at the present day have a preference for religious reading. The frequent revivals that take place bring forward many youth. Vital religion quickens & strengthens the intellect, & increases the taste for literature. Of this character are a great number of the teachers. Their taste is infused into the minds of pupils. Sabbath schools embrace much the greater part of the children. Their instruction & reading have, of course, a religious cast, & give an early direction to the taste of the readers.—I am therefore persuaded that a good proportion of the School Libraries must be of a decidedly religious character, to meet the wishes & secure the approbation of the community. I do not mean books that are controversial, that are anti-errorist, designed to combat different opinions, but such as reason

[10] *Second Report*, pp. 76, 77.

affirmatively, without assailing opposite sentiments, such as speak of truth as an admitted principle, without an intimation that it is questioned or questionable. One may present the leading evidences of the truth of the Copernican system, or of the inspiration of the Scriptures, without saying anything of opposite theories.

I do not say these things Sir, from any limited views. I have a high respect for all the Members of the Board, & as one of the number, I have no object, if I know myself, but to promote the objects for which it was created. And I do not suppose that any one will dissent from these suggestions.—Such books as I have in view it is not difficult to procure. Any of the works of Mrs. More, Edward's History of Redemption, an immortal work, some of the writings of Doddridge, & Watts, Payson's Works, and a good deal of American Biography. In history, Rollin, designed for the youth of France, is the best thing extant. But it is very long. If his ancient history or his Roman history could be abridged, or selections made, & retain his spirit, it would be very desirable. Dr. Bancroft's Life of Washington is very good. So is Ramsay's American Revolution. I think Sir, we had better proceed moderately, taking sufficient time for a work of so much importance.—I have some jealousy of my neighbor Mr. Holmes. I have not seen him since he left the Council-chamber. But I know his character. He is very fond of management, has a great share of secretiveness, & is very persevering. I presume he will engage in the service of the N.Y. Society. They feel, undoubtedly, if they can master old Massa. they will have N. Eng. under their wing.

Mr. Davis agreed to apply to Mr. Gallaudet, to be our first Teacher. I think he may well be our first choice. I have also written to him, having been long acquainted. If we can procure him, he & you can compile a sett [*sic*] of School Books. I have thought of Henry Jones of Greenfield. His wife, N. Webster's daughter, is very accomplished. Gallaudet's wife is a Mute. What do you think of Ethan A. Andrews? Is he too old? Has he changed his business too often? We must have, if possible, the first man. Please to think, and look.

I want to know, distinctly, the department, & names, of our standing Committees. Will you write & give them? With great respect your friend & humble servant, Thomas Robbins.

Passing by, for the present, the suggestions regarding teachers for the normal schools, the reference to Mr. Holmes is illumi-

nated by an interesting extract from the minutes of the meeting of the Board on June 1, 1838:

> The Rev. Sylvester Holmes of New Bedford appeared before the Board & communicated a request from the Messrs. Harpers of New York, that the Board would approve or recommend a series of Books, now in preparation by that House, as suitable books for District School Libraries. No member of the Board ever having seen said series of books, & the Rev. Mr. Holmes not being able to state even what were the titles of any of them, the Board directed the Secretary to make such reply to Mr. Holmes as he might deem proper, without pledging the Board to any future course of action.[11]

Amusing as this incident is, revealing not only a lack of preparation on the part of the agent seeking a recommendation for his books, but also a failure to appreciate the Board's serious purpose, it suggests the annoyance and danger to which a well-prepared and determined effort might subject the Board and the developing cause of education. Such an effort was already under way, the result of which was soon to raise the prejudice and opposition of individuals among the rival sects of the State that not only threatened to destroy the gains made in education, but for several years made the continued existence of the Board uncertain.

The Board carried forward the plans for the Library through the year, and in the *Second Report,* dated January 14, 1839, announced that the two series would be published by Marsh,

[11] There is a letter, among the "Mann Papers," written by Rev. Gorham D. Abbott of New Rochelle, New York, to Rev. Sylvester Holmes, dated May 24, 1838. The writer urges Mr. Holmes to secure, if possible, the coöperation of the Massachusetts Board of Education in the enterprise of "our Committee," which is publishing a library. He hopes the Board will unite with "our Committee," and thus concentrate the forces of the two organizations. But if this cannot be done, "Perhaps they will be willing to give some recommendation of our selection, while theirs is preparing, if they choose to go on alone." He also says, "The Harpers, of course will act with [our] Committee in carrying into effect any good plan to unite & concentrate our forces." This letter would indicate that the library in question was being published by Harpers for some independent organization.

Capen & Lyon of Boston, under the Board's supervision.[12] The plan of requiring unanimous approval of the Board for each book, in order to avoid sectarianism, was set forth, and care was taken to have the public understand that the purchase of the Library was entirely optional, and that there was no desire to encroach upon the authority of the school committees with whom the power of selecting schoolbooks and books for the school libraries rested. The publishers soon issued a circular, and the plan was advertised by articles in the *Common School Journal*. The first ten volumes of the larger series were published in September, 1839.[13]

[12] The title of the Library had been changed to "The Massachusetts School Library, First Series," and "The Massachusetts School Library, Second Series."—Minutes, December 27, 1838.

[13] These books were: *Life of Columbus,* by Washington Irving; *Paley's Natural Theology,* Adapted for the School Library by Elisha Bartlett, M.D. (2 vols.); *Lives of Eminent Individuals, Celebrated in American History* (3 vols.); *The Sacred Philosophy of the Seasons,* by Rev. Henry Duncan, D.D., of Scotland, Adapted by Rev. F. W. P. Greenwood, D.D., of Boston (4 vols.).

CHAPTER V

The Packard Episode

AT the annual meeting of the American Sunday School Union held in Philadelphia, May 23, 1837, it was decided to select from the numerous books published by that society a group of volumes for use as a library for common schools.[1] A "Select Library" of one hundred and twenty-one volumes was formed and advertised in newspapers in various parts of the country.[2]

In March, 1838, Frederick A. Packard of Philadelphia, the Recording Secretary and Editor of Publications of the American Sunday School Union, began a series of five letters which appeared in successive issues of the *New York Observer* and the *Boston Recorder*. These letters urged the wider use of the Union's books in New England. In the first letter the writer states that few of its publications are found north and east of the Hudson. He has learned that many doubt their high evangelical character, and "that an impression prevails that they are not sufficiently elevated in style or matter for the favored children of the north, and that New England people are disposed on the whole to supply their own wants in their own way." The second letter announces the library for common schools.[3] It consists of one hundred and twenty volumes (the Union's Report for 1838 says there were one hundred and twenty-one volumes) in a case with lock and key and fifty catalogues, the complete set to be

[1] *Thirteenth Annual Report of the American Sunday School Union,* Philadelphia, 1837, p. 8. The American Sunday School Union was founded in 1825, with headquarters in Philadelphia. It is interdenominational in organization.

[2] *Fourteenth Annual Report of the American Sunday School Union,* Philadelphia, 1838, pp. 17, 18.

[3] *New York Observer,* March 10, 1838; *Boston Recorder,* March 16, 1838. The letter is dated Philadelphia, March 3, 1838.

sold for thirty-three dollars. Packard foresees some difficulty in placing these books in the schools, and frankly concedes that some people in a majority of the districts may not subscribe to all the sentiments they inculcate:

> The existence of a God, the inspiration of the Scriptures, a future state of retribution, are facts which some men deny—and strange as it may seem, the inculcation of these doctrines is by many called *Sectarism,* and the book which inculcates them is called a *Sectarian book.* I do not understand the term to apply to these cases; but be this as it may, I take it that every school district in New England, has a right to buy this or any other library, and put it up in the school room for the use of the school children. Neither the Legislature nor the Board of Education can control a district in this matter, so long as the law authorizes the raising of money for this purpose, or so long as the district may see fit in any other lawful way to obtain possession of it. Each district is, so far, an independent government. If I am a Universalist or a Freethinker, resident in the district, I may vote, and speak and protest against the introduction of the books, and may remove my children from the school, rather than have them instructed in such sentiments; or I may prohibit them to read or bring them home; but so long as the majority of voters in the district see fit to keep the books there, so long I must submit. Whenever I can bring a majority of the district to think with me, we will turn the school committee and the library out of the house together, and put in such a committee and such books as we prefer.

As we shall have occasion to examine other letters and articles written by Mr. Packard, it is well at this point to note that he differed fundamentally from the terms of the Law of 1827 and from the purpose of the men who framed it. We saw that the committee who reported the bill regarded it as a measure to protect the schools from the introduction of the religious controversies which had divided the churches. The town school committee, to whom was given the authority to select schoolbooks for all the schools of the town, was forbidden from introducing any of a sectarian character. But Packard would nullify this law and let the majority elect a school committee who would in-

troduce books teaching their own religious views, even if the children of the minority should thereby be driven from the schools. In taking this position, Packard placed himself in direct opposition to the law and to the Board of Education and Horace Mann, whose work must necessarily be in harmony with the terms of the law.

In Mr. Mann's Journal is an interesting entry which was not published by Mrs. Mann in the *Life*. It is dated March 18, [1838] Sunday, and reads:

> Several days ago, I received a letter from Fred. A. Packard of Philadelphia, enquiring whether Abbott's Child at Home, would be admitted into District School Libraries in this State. Having got the book and read it, I have today written him a long answer, condemning the book *in toto* so far as the views of a great portion of our people are concerned. For my own part, I should rather no District Library should ever be formed, than to have them, if they must be composed of such books as that.

Mr. Packard's first letter was not preserved. As the correspondence subsequently shows, Mr. Mann could not foresee Packard's designs, and regarding his letter as a personal one and unimportant—one among many he was writing and receiving every day[4]—destroyed it. Mann's own letter, written on the date of his Journal entry, clearly indicates the nature of the book and the doctrines that would make it unacceptable in Massachusetts:

> Boston, March 18, 1838. F. A. Packard Esq. Dear Sir: I received your letter of Mar. 7th some days since, & immediately addressed a copy of the *Report* requested, to you. This I had intended to do, & was only waiting to ascertain your Christian name.
>
> I had never read "Abbott's Child at Home." I immediately asked a

[4] Mr. Mann wrote on an average thirty letters a day at this time. The niggardliness of the legislature in failing to provide for his office expenses made it necessary for him to write all these letters with his own hand. Always on the verge of physical breakdown, he toiled sixteen hours a day in his "sacred cause."

bookseller to supply me with a copy, which he delayed to do for several days, & I hope you will accept this as an apology for so late a reply.

I have read the book tho' rather hastily, and I cannot hesitate a moment in saying, that it would not be tolerated in this State, as a District School Library book.

This dear Sir, is an answer to your inquiry, but it may be, that you would like to be informed of the reasons of the opinion expressed. I will therefore, take the liberty to state one or two of them.

The book would be in the highest degree, offensive to the Universalists. In this State, we have about 300 towns: & there are more than one hundred *societies* of Universalists; & besides, very many of that denomination are scattered all over the State amongst other denominations.

The clergymen especially manifest great interest in our common schools. I do not think that the clergymen of any other denomination take *more,* if so much, interest in our schools as they do, in proportion to their numbers; & I do not think it too much to say, that many, if not most of them would rather see the whole system abolished than to have such a book introduced. I would refer you, on this point to such passages as those on pp. 13th and 28th. (I have the 10th edition.)

The whole scope & tenor of the book would ill accord with the views of Unitarians, whether clergymen or laymen:—among other things, for the following reasons:—

It makes scarcely a perceptible discrimination between offences, (indeed I do not know as it makes any)—denouncing eternal perdition for the most trivial neglects or acts of disobedience, committed in the thoughtlessness of childhood; & of course classing them, in regard to consequences, with a whole life of heaven-contemning wickedness. In this respect, the book would shock the moral & religious feelings of a large portion of our community.

The manner in which the book enforces the duty of obedience would be excepted to, as arbitrary & mechanical. In the book, obedience takes so conspicuous a place, that one would suppose the author considered it as the highest virtue. Many of our people believe that affection and love of God, is a far higher and more desirable feeling to inspire, than blind obedience, and that the book forgets the higher in urging the lower state of mind. Besides this injunction of obedience supposes, that there is no doubt, as to the nature of the command. But to settle the question, what is commanded? is often the most difficult part of the case; & therefore, they would say, it is of much higher consequence

to inspire a love of duty, as one of the best councillors in determining what our duty may be, as well as in securing its performance.

Again, it would be said, that the book dwells far more on future, & perhaps remote, retribution, & less on the immediate, & instantaneous effects of bad conduct, upon a child's mind, than is right: A child has comparatively a dim perception of the future, but a very lively one of the present. When a child does any thing, without knowing it to be wrong, then the act is not wrong, & he ought not to be threatened with punishment for it. If the child knows the act to be wrong, then remorse is inevitable; & in regard to children, at least, the attention should be mainly directed to this fact, in the constitution of its own nature.

There is scarcely anything in the book which presents the character of God in an amiable, or lovely aspect. Gratitude is enjoined, without presenting that combination of qualities, which excites gratitude. Nor is the Deity invested in the book, with the attributes which excite *affection* & this is a far better state of mind than gratitude.

It is very remarkable, that, while the whole book proceeds upon the ground, that children have a natural disinclination to love what is good & to hearken to what is wise in their Maker; yet, in the last chapter, the elements of faith & love & obedience are stated with great clearness, and their natural, and inevitable effects are regarded as laws of the moral nature. "The worst dispositioned boy in the world *cannot help admiring generosity.*" "If you habitually act upon this principle" (that of kindness) "*you will never want for friends*"—"Henry—knows you give up," (the bat) "to accommodate him. *How can he help liking you for it.*" "The fact is that neither man nor child can cultivate a spirit of generosity & kindness, *without attracting affection and esteem.*" "This is not *peculiar to childhood, but is the same in all periods of life.*" p. 150. Again, "If you are not loved, *it is good evidence, that you do not deserve to be loved.*" p. 148. Now tens of thousands of our people will say, this is just as true when God, as when man, is the object; i.e. if God be represented in his true character. But my page is almost full, & I will not trouble you with another. I am sorry I have not had time to put these views in better shape, but if I had not seized upon a leisure half-hour, at the present time, I must have delayed an answer several days longer. I hope however I have given you some *hints,* why the book would be offensive here. Very respectfully,

Horace Mann.

Mann's criticisms of the book were accurate. A striking picture of the judgment is found in the chapter on "Deception":

But we must not forget that there is a day of most solemn judgment near at hand. When you die, your body will be wrapped in the shroud, and placed in the coffin, and buried in the grave; and there it will remain and moulder to the dust, while the snows of unnumbered winters, and the tempests of unnumbered summers, shall rest upon the cold earth which covers you. But your spirit will not be there. Far away, beyond the cloudless skies, and blazing suns, and twinkling stars, it will have gone to judgment. How awful must be the scene which will open before you, as you enter the eternal world! You will see the throne of God: how bright, how glorious, will it burst upon your sight! You will see God the Savior seated upon that majestic throne. Angels, in numbers more than can be counted, will fill the universe with their glittering wings, and their rapturous songs. Oh, what a scene to behold! And then you will stand in the presence of this countless throng to answer for every thing you have done while you lived. Every action and every thought of your life will then be fresh in your mind. You know it is written in the Bible, "God will bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil." How must the child then feel who has been guilty of falsehood and deception, and has it then all brought to light! No liar can enter the kingdom of heaven. Oh, how dreadful must be the confusion and shame with which the deceitful child will then be overwhelmed! The angels will all see your sin and your disgrace. And do you think they will wish to have a liar enter heaven, to be associated with them? No! They must turn from you with disgust. The Savior will look upon you in his displeasure. Conscience will rend your soul. And you must hear the awful sentence, "Depart from me, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Oh, it is a dreadful thing to practice deceit. It will shut you from heaven. It will confine you in eternal wo. Though you should escape detection as long as you live; though you should die, and your falsehood not be discovered, the time will soon come when it will all be brought to light, and when the whole universe of men and of angels will be witnesses of your shame. If any child who reads this feels condemned for past deceptions, oh, beware, and do not postpone repentance till the day of judgment shall arrive.[5]

[5] Pp. 42-44. The chapter is introduced by the time-honored tradition of

Packard replied under date of March 28, 1838. He now endeavored to get Mann to give his opinion on a list of thirty-seven books selected from the Union's school library. In this letter he was conciliatory; he thanked Mann for the frank manner in which he had expressed his views, and assured him that he was not seeking controversy. He confessed that he had been testing Mann's opinion. But he had "no purpose to promote which is not common to any good citizen of our country." He had already marked the very passages cited by Mann, and was "perfectly aware how very offensive they would be to Universalists." But he did not see how the "principles of piety," etc., could be taught without using this type of theology. Moreover, his theory that the majority had the right to decide what kind of religion should be taught in the schools—a theory which we saw clearly enunciated in his *Boston Recorder* letter of March 16—was echoed in this letter. It is evident that he had no conception of complete religious freedom, the principle which had but so recently triumphed in the disestablishment of the Congregational church in Massachusetts in 1833.[6]

Mann did not reply to this letter; nor did he have time, in the pressure of his many duties, to examine a large number of books out of a library which, by Packard's own confession in the *Boston Recorder,* issue of March 16, twelve days before this letter was written, was offensive to certain people in the majority of the districts. Failing in this attempt, the Union's secretary sent to Mr. Mann a primer and a spelling book requesting his opinion of them. Packard's letter was not preserved, but its contents may be inferred from Mann's reply:

Boston June 23, 1838. F. A. Packard, Esq. Dear Sir: After two or three weeks absence from the city, I returned last evening, when I found

George Washington's hatchet. The only difference between the story as told in 1833 and that of today is that the youthful George is represented not as having chopped down a cherry tree, but as having hacked the bark of a pear tree until the tree was completely ruined.

[6] This letter is printed in full in Appendix A, pp. 243-245.

your note accompanied by the favor of a Primmer & Spelling-book. I beg you to accept my acknowledgements for them.

In your note you express a regret that I did not answer your last letter. I read it over once for the very purpose of learning whether you had been thinking of a reply while writing it, & came to the conclusion you had not, & I thought it better to omit the civility of an acknowledgement, than to tax you with the postage of a letter. Otherwise I should have answered it, & I am sorry you should have tho't it possible I had taken offence. I confess I do not like polemics. Such vast, such indefinite good may be accomplished by a union of effort on these points, on which we all agree, that it seems a little better than suicidal perpetually to fasten our attention upon those wherein we differ.

I am very desirous to learn what success is found to attend the experiment of teaching *words* before *letters*. They are now adopting that course in this city, & I believe, with general approval. It seems to me most Philosophical. It has been suggested to me, however, by an experienced teacher, that it is only a transposition of labor;—that tho' it will be easy to teach words first, it will be difficult to teach the letters composing them afterwards. It is a case where I should not be decided by a *majority* of voices nor even by a unanimity, *the first quarter*. It is certainly a very important question in the process, & I hope it will receive the attention of minds competent to decide it correctly. You must allow me to say in reference to both books, that tho' I am no artist, I cannot admire the *cuts*. Is it not of great consequence, what models, emblems, pictures, children are accustomed to look upon, especially when their minds are in a state of agreeable excitement? I know the expense of fine work cannot—or rather will not—be borne—still the pictures ought not be such as to hit the child's ideality on the wrong side, & inspire fear instead of admiration.

However well adapted your Spelling-book may be to the growth & progressiveness of young minds; it has numerous passages, which would exclude it from the schools in Massachusetts;—such as are to be found in the 9th & 18th Reading lessons, for instance. For my own part, I should object still more strenuously to the idea inculcated in the 31st Lesson,—that of referring the common events of life to Divine interposition. It seems to me the most dangerous of all teaching,—tending more than anything else to unsettle all sound notions, respecting the constitution of the system in which we are placed,—which is a system of fixed, unrepealed, unsuspended laws, & whoever

transgresses them, or comes in collision with them, knowingly, or ignorantly, be he saint or sinner, must suffer the consequences. Besides that belief cuts both ways. How can a child who has adopted such views, account for the disastrous terminations which happen to the enterprises of good boys, or for the fortunate ones which crown the exploits of the wicked? The falling of a brick depends in no degree upon a boy's moral character or conduct, but wholly upon the laws of gravitation, & to teach so, it seems to me is to teach an error, which will probably be the seed of crimes.

In your former letter you institute a course of argument to show that the passages which I marked in the "Child at Home," as offensive to Universalists, may still be taught, within the express provisions of our law, because that law requires that the "principles of piety" shall be "impressed upon the minds of children & youth"; & as piety is the discharge of our duty to God, & as that duty cannot be discharged, without a knowledge of his character & attributes, it follows that to teach the principles of piety, we must teach that character, and those attributes—that is, Mr. Abbott's views of them, as expressed in the passages, referred to;—nay, if I understand the comprehensiveness of the conclusion, the principles of piety cannot be taught without doing so. Is it possible, my dear Sir, you can mean to say; that no person who does not adopt those views can be *pious!* Is no Universalist *pious?* And who is he that understands the character and attributes of God? tho' we may talk about His infinite holiness & perfect justice, yet how little more than words they are in the mouths even of the greatest and purest of mortals! What are even their conceptions of infinity—of perfection? I would not say merely, that such a definition of piety never was contemplated by the framers of the law; but it seems to me that such a definition excludes & must forever exclude piety from the *created* universe. There not only is not, but there never can be a *pious* being in it.

Another topic is animadverted upon. Tho' you allow we are so constituted, that remorse follows wrong-doing—that pain and disease follow intemperance;—yet you say these consequences are not *generally* sufficient repellants. And why?—Not as I believe from any mistake or oversight in the original constitution of man, nor from any love of error or wrong, into which they have since fallen, but because the earthly portion of their natures is highly cultivated, while their moral and religious sentiments are mainly neglected. The whole moral nature is left almost a waste, & the sublime pleasures, which attend its ac-

tivity are not known, & instead of cultivating the religious nature, all effort is expended upon the inculcation of doctrines & creeds, & the modes of adroitly defending them. A creed, an intellectual conviction, however strong, is not the natural antagonist of an earthly propensity:—the pleasures of a moral sentiment, of contemplating goodness, of doing good,—these *antagonize*, & I believe, would do so successfully if they were but one tenth part as much cultivated as the former. At most there can be no more pleasure in a creed, than in a logical exercise. Hence it seldom proves a match for the impulses. Some of our propensities have been so much indulged and exercised, that they demand their gratification, tho' it be at the expense of our better sentiments, which have been neglected, and inactive, but it is not for the pain's sake, nor for the wrong's sake. But suppose those sources of happiness were pointed out, which involve no consequences of pain or wrong, their conformity to our moral constitution shown, their coincidence with the Divine will made manifest, then our relations to the *earth*—as such—would occupy their proper sphere,—not extirpated but controlled, not destroyed but subordinated.

But I had no idea of writing this, when I sat down, & I cannot suppose it will modify views, so long-considered as your own. You must excuse my plainness of speech. My feelings are certainly respectful. I shall be glad to hear from you again, tho' I do not think I shall be led to reply again at such length and in the discussion of such topics. Yrs. very respectfully Horace Mann

Horace Mann, in giving expression to his views of human nature, was quite in harmony with Unitarian optimism, and at variance with Calvinistic pessimism. He believed that man was essentially good, and rejected the doctrine of human depravity and the necessity of conversion. These personal views and the emphasis on the need for adequate moral and religious education in the place of creedal instruction were not to be overlooked by Packard.

This letter was not mailed. Calling at the Boston office of the American Sunday School Union to ascertain Packard's correct title, Mann learned that he was expected in the city the same evening and left an invitation for him to call. Packard came, and the two spent an hour discussing the general subject of

religious education. At the close of the interview Packard requested, and was given, the letter which Mann had written.

The Secretary of the American Sunday School Union was now ready to attack, and he selected the most strategic point to launch his offensive. Going to New Bedford the following day, he attended the meeting of the Massachusetts General Association, where approximately one hundred ministers of Orthodox Congregational churches of Massachusetts, and a like number of laymen of these churches, were assembled. Having obtained permission to address the convention, he reminded his hearers of the Puritan days "when the schoolmaster was set apart to his office with solemn religious ceremonies" and when the doctrines of the Christian religion were fully taught in the schools. There was danger that the recent so-called improvements in education would delude the clergy, whose own influence in the schools was on the wane. Books of an evangelical character which teach a future state of retribution, such as Abbott's *Child at Home,* would be rejected by the Board of Education and the Secretary. The doctrines of Special Providence and Regeneration as understood by most Christians would be avoided. "If this class of opinions is to prevail at the Board of Education," he said, "it becomes Ministers of the Gospel, and Christian people throughout the Commonwealth, to see to it." He then urged the use in the public schools, of the Select Library of the American Sunday School Union, a set of which was displayed on the pulpit stairs during his speech. This library, he assured his hearers, "did illustrate the great doctrines of the Christian faith, and was pervaded with the spirit of Christianity."

At the close of his address, Packard left the building to prepare for his return to Philadelphia. He was soon called back by a friend who informed him that a member of the Board of Education was about to reply to his remarks. The speaker was Dr. Thomas Robbins, who had been out of the room during

Packard's speech, but who on coming in, had been urged by Rev. Warren Fay, D.D., of Charlestown, and Rev. Enoch Sanford of Raynham, to speak in defense of the Board.

Dr. Robbins stated that the Board had not yet decided to recommend any books for the schools, nor had they decided against any. They had voted not to introduce any books without the unanimous approval of the Board. He hoped that no one would anticipate the Board's action on the question of books for the schools.

A motion having been passed allowing Packard to reply to Dr. Robbins, he repeated his former observations, then taking from his pocket Mr. Mann's letter, which he had asked for at the close of the interview in Boston, he proposed to read it in support of his statements. His remark that he presumed that the Secretary, who was a highly honorable gentleman, had no idea that the letter would be used for this purpose, brought several men to their feet to object to its reading. One man then remarked that it was not necessary; for he had personally heard Mr. Mann express similar views. The seriousness of what he had done now began to dawn upon Packard, and he made the surprising request that the matter should not be made known outside of that assembly, and that no public use be made of it. Dr. Snell of North Brookfield, the moderator of the meeting, fearing that the question might involve the General Association in some difficulty with the Board of Education, refused to allow further discussion, though Dr. Robbins briefly repeated his denial of Packard's charges.

After returning home from New Bedford, Dr. Robbins wrote to Mr. Mann, reporting Packard's action. Upon receiving this news, Mann wrote to Rev. Enoch Sanford of Raynham, whose reply substantiated Robbins' account with the exception of a statement that Packard had charged the Board with intention to recommend "anti-evangelical" books. This statement by Robbins was probably incorrect, and was doubtless due to his habit,

noticed elsewhere in his writings, of using the term *anti*-evangelical when he actually meant *non*-evangelical.[7]

Before receiving word from Mr. Sanford, however, Mann wrote the following letter to Packard:

Boston July 5 1838 F. A. Packard Esq. Dear Sir, Within two or three days after my late interview with you at my rooms in Boston, I had occasion to leave the city, from which I have been absent until last evening. The first piece of information, I learned on my return was one which equally surprised & grieved me. I was informed, from a source, which I should not for a moment think of questioning, were it not for the almost incredible nature of the fact communicated, that at a meeting of the "General Association of Massachusetts" held last week at New Bedford, (where I recollect you told me you were going the next morning) having obtained leave to speak, you stated, among other things, that the Board of Education of this State would recommend books for schools that were anti-evangelical, and that, after the correctness of that statement had been explicitly denied by a Member of the Board, who alleged facts, proving its utter groundlessness, you then held up a letter, said it was from Mr. Mann & that it would sustain the charge, you had made.

I feel, Sir, an insuperable reluctance to express the feelings, which such information derived from so authentic a source, excites within me, before stating the case, with frankness to you & offering to make any substantial explanation welcome. You will perceive on a moment's reflection, that the violation of the confidence of private intercourse, which the information if correct supposes; the utter falsity of any such declaration, if any such were made, and the grievous consequences, which must necessarily result, if the slightest credence were given to it, make the affair one of great importance to me, and to the cause of human improvement thro' the means of education, which, if I know my own heart, I am willing to support, with my health & if need be with my life. You must allow me, therefore to make two requests. The first is that you will give me an account of what was said & done by yourself in relation to the letter, to me & to the Board of Education, so that if you were in fact misapprehended, the error may be rectified. The other is, that you will return me the original letter

[7] Copies of these letters from Robbins and Sanford are in Appendix B, pp. 284-286.

which you held up as a voucher on that occasion, in order that I may be able to satisfy the Board of the incorrectness of the representation as it has gone abroad. I have not the slightest objection to your retaining a copy of the letter if you choose, as it contains nothing, which on any proper occasion for making public I have the shadow of a desire to conceal. But for the satisfaction of the Board and of my friends, I desire the possession of the original. I hope I may hear from you as early as your convenience will allow. Yours with due respect, Horace Mann.

Packard immediately replied.[8] He stated that soon after the "Select Library" had been prepared for the market, he had written a "long official letter" to Governor Everett explaining the Union's object, describing the library, and assuring him that the books "could not be justly opposed upon the grounds of sectarianism, in any fair and proper construction of that term." He had stated to the Governor that his object in writing "was to secure for the Library the notice of the Board of Education, and others who might be interested in the subject." A few weeks later he had been informed by Mr. Tappan, the Union's agent in Boston, that "Mr. Mann had called there and expressed the opinion that the library would not answer for schools in Massachusetts, for the books were sectarian, and esteemed so by Gov. Everett." Believing that Mann was prejudiced and had not carefully examined the books, he had decided to test his views by securing his opinion of Abbott's *Child at Home*, which he had found listed in a catalogue of a common school library in Geneseo, New York. Mann's reply and his subsequent invitation to Packard to call upon him had led to the interview in the former's office, which Packard had enjoyed. He says:

At this time we had a free, & full interchange of views for an hour. You expressed your views very freely on the *general subject* of Religious Education, & advanced the opinion that the mind of a child, should not be influenced on this subject until its judgment is sufficiently matured to weigh the evidence & arguments for itself, that

[8] For the full text of this letter, see Appendix A, pp. 250 ff.

the doctrines of revealed religion could not be safely connected with a course of public instruction &c &c.

In his account of his remarks at the General Association meeting in New Bedford, Packard fails to mention his request that his offer to read Mann's letter be kept secret. He states that he did not consider Dr. Robbins' remarks called for a reply; but as the motion which was passed allowing him to answer Robbins seemed to imply that the truth of his statements had been questioned, and that an explanation was necessary, he spoke again. He confesses that he regretted the necessity of defending himself by reference to Mann's letter, and assures him that it was entirely unpremeditated—"It was the result of the moment."

In his own defense, however, he states that he has always regarded Mann's views expressed to him, as those of a public man. His own views were expressed with the same impression, and he would "feel bound by them anywhere and everywhere." He would not publish the correspondence in the newspapers without having first obtained Mann's consent; but he would "not hesitate to speak of them on all proper occasions, and to show their fallacy." He continues:

I found at New Bedford a convention representing, I presume, a majority of the Christian taxpayers of Massachusetts & men whose influence if fairly & legitimately exerted would go far towards giving character to the Educational institutions of Massachusetts. I was there to obtain their favor towards our library and it became me to show that some efficient action was necessary to secure its salutary influence on Common School children of that State. Unless there were known or supposed to be opposite opinions of the subject no occasion for effort might appear, and hence the pertinency & propriety of stating what were understood to be the views entertained by the highest & most influential man connected with public instruction in the State & who might be supposed to understand thoroughly the ground on which the system was to be carried out & built up. That these views were intended to be *confidentially* expressed, I presume you will not

say, nor wish to have them considered so. At all events, no intimation of the kind is given or implied in the correspondence, so far as I recollect.—I have no secrets on this subject, and I am sure (if I know your character) you have none. My views relative to this *one point* have been long ago settled & expressed, & have received the cordial concurrence & most flattering approbation of some of the best & wisest men in New England & among them several who agree with you in religious sentiments. I send you a marked pamphlet, that you may connect my established views, with my present proceedings & see that it is not a new notion or something designed to excite public notice. In attempting to convert others to these opinions, I meet a man holding one of the most commanding positions in the country, (so far as the interests of public instruction are concerned) & withal prepared to express his views strongly, decidedly & emphatically in direct opposition to my theory. He has constant opportunities to inculcate these views & does it, virtually in public documents. Surely I am justified, in every aspect of the case, in making known those opposing views, in showing their unsoundness and fallacy and pernicious tendency (if I can) & especially when my official correspondence has made me acquainted with them & my official duty requires me (as it did on the late occasion) to combat them or show their character that others may combat them.

If I have been betrayed into any error of motive or action I refuse not to make any reparation that justice or Christian courtesy may require—I have given you the facts according to the best of my recollection—You will perceive *that they are totally different in their character & impression from what was stated to you.* For their correctness I appeal to the Rev. Mr. Albro of Cambridge, Mr. Brainard of this City (who were among the gentlemen present & known to me) & also to Rev Mr Smith & Mr Tappan our agents who were also present. I send you the original letter as you request retaining a copy (certified) and shall feel at liberty still to use the correspondence & conversation between us, on any proper occasion, publicly, being assured by your last letter, of what I presumed to be the case before, "that there is nothing in them in which you have the shadow of a desire to conceal."

No suggestion is given by means of which Mr. Packard's "marked pamphlet" can be identified. His habit of writing anonymously complicates the problem. But there is in the Yale

Library an article reprinted from the *Quarterly Observer* of Philadelphia entitled: "Thoughts on the Condition and Prospects of Popular Education in the United States," by a citizen of Pennsylvania. Though anonymous, the Yale Library attributes this to Frederick A. Packard. It is undated, but its contents show that it was written before the passage of the Law of 1837, creating the Board and the Secretaryship. The writer is in favor of public schools, and believes that state boards of education and state superintendents of schools are needed. He urges the necessity of teaching religion in the public schools. In describing the duties of the local school committee, he says:

> More than all, such commissioners would rigidly inspect the teacher's method of bringing the great truths of Christianity to bear on the minds and hearts of his pupils, so that while, on the one hand, the school should be protected from the evils of bigotry, sectarianism, and fanaticism, it shall be secured, on the other, against the equally destructive influence of a heartless, intolerant infidelity. For it should never be forgotten that, in the present blindness and madness of the human heart, infidelity will always compromise with truth on the basis of mutual forebearance. She knows her position too well to refuse a treaty on these terms; and we ought to know ours too well to propose or accept it.

On page 15, we find ideas which bear striking resemblance to Packard's letter of March 28:

> How are the principles of virtue to be taught and enforced without reference to the being and Government of God, and a future state of rewards and punishments?

It is evident that Packard's conception of what constituted sectarianism was quite different from that of the Board of Education and Mr. Mann. The American Sunday School Union's examining committee consisted of two Methodists, two Baptists, two Episcopalians, and two Presbyterians.[9] The Union considered that books passed by this committee were non-sectarian.

[9] *New York Observer*, March 17, 1838.

Packard refused to accept the broader interpretation as applying to distinctions between evangelical sects and those classed as unevangelical. The latter he branded as "a heartless, intolerant infidelity."

But even though it be granted that Packard was sincere in his conviction that the orthodox, evangelical doctrines of Christianity should be taught in the public schools, nevertheless his action was dictated in part by another motive. His letter admits that he went to New Bedford to promote the sale of his library.

Unable immediately to write a full answer to Packard's letter, Mann sent the following note:

Boston, July 11th, 1838. F. A. Packard Esq. Dear Sir I forward, according to your request just received, a copy of the only one of your letters, which I preserved, or at all events, which I can find. I believe there were two others, one previous & one subsequent to the above. The first requested my opinion, whether Abbott's "Child at Home," would be acceptable to our School districts for a School Library Book, & the principal point in the last was a request that I would answer your letter,—the one copied above. I have been able to give your letter rec. tonight but a hasty perusal. *I have several things to say in relation to its contents,* but I am at present overwhelmed with engagements. I would answer it tonight, but it is now past midnight & my health is feeble, & now suffering. In the meantime, I request [you] to forward me my first letter to you, (preserving a copy if you desire so to do), as I find by your own confession, that that letter was also referred to by you, at N Bedford & its spirit & object misrepresented—Yours &c Horace Mann.

This was answered by a note from Packard, accompanied by the letter requested.[10]

Mann's promised letter—his final one—was written July 22, 1838. He defends his own position, corrects certain wrong impressions Packard had gained, and accuses him of violating his confidence and misrepresenting his views. It is a long letter.[11]

[10] See Appendix A, p. 255.

[11] The full text may be found in Appendix A, pp. 256-269.

Mann reminds his correspondent that he had wished to avoid a controversy on theological subjects, not only because of personal preference, but also because of his official position in a state whose laws forbid the use of sectarian textbooks in the schools. He says the law has met with almost no opposition for years:

> Of this law you were aware, because you referred to it in a former letter. Nor is it a new enactment. For many years it has been in operation with almost universal acceptance. In a Legislature of more than five hundred men, I do not believe that in any year for ten years past, during which time I have been acquainted with most of the members, that ten men could have been found who would vote for its repeal. It has been ratified by an almost unanimous public opinion. The people have acted almost uniformly in accordance with its spirit. In towns where there are clergymen of different denominations all are generally put upon the school committee. If too numerous, the different sects are represented in rotation. In some places where there is a strong feeling against having any clergymen on the Board, all are left off by unanimous consent. The great idea is, that those points of doctrine, or faith, upon which good, and great men differ, shall not be obtruded into this mutual ground of the schools. The children of men of all denominations, attend the school together. If one man claimed to have his peculiar doctrines taught, why not another? why not all?—until you would have a Babel of creeds in the same school, which a heathen would be ashamed of. All therefore, or almost all amongst us accede to the essential justice, as well as the practical expediency of this course. Though each one cannot have his children taught all he could wish, yet they may be taught many invaluable things,—the rudiments of knowledge, propriety of manners, social duty, practical morality. The tendency of all this, is most happy. It brings opponents to act in concert together for the attainment of a great good—and thereby restores the lost feelings of Brotherhood which controversy tends to obliterate—Besides, suppose there were attempts to teach peculiar tenets in the schools, and the schools were thereby broken up, as they undoubtedly would be, each advocate for the course would be as far from his object as he was before . . .

Mann had not foreseen the attack for which Packard had

been preparing. Reviewing their correspondence and the interview, he reminds Packard how the latter had put him off his guard, for he had regarded these as private and personal. Though Packard is willing to express his theological views "anywhere and everywhere," it does not follow that Mann should do the same:

> Now how is it possible you could overlook the difference in our cases? You are engaged for a society which consists of a part only of the Christian community. I am engaged for a Body which represents every Religious denomination in the State. Yours is founded upon the plan of propagating your peculiar views, ours upon the plan of non-interference with peculiar views. Allowing that it may be proper for you to attend assemblies of a particular denomination, and there promulgate your notions, it does not follow that it is proper for me to do so. Allowing that it is perfectly proper for you to presume that the meeting at New Bedford represented a "Majority of the Christian taxpayers of Massachusetts," (in contradistinction I suppose from those taxpayers who are not entitled to be called Christians) still, can you fail to perceive how improper it would be for me to go to the public meetings of particular sects and imitate your example. However consonant such a course may be to your feelings, and your station, it is wholly repugnant to mine. The inference derived from this source to justify yourself for introducing me, my correspondence, and conversation, at that time is therefore wholly unwarranted.

After reproving his assailant for his attempt to keep secret his action at New Bedford and his failure to mention this in his letter of July 9, giving an account of that action—a reproof couched in language that would make any honest man extremely uncomfortable—Mann proceeds to indicate points in which Packard has misrepresented him. He spends some time in showing that before the attack at New Bedford, Packard had addressed him as a private citizen, while his letters subsequent to the attack had addressed Mann as "Secretary of the Board of Education." He charges that Packard had advanced Mann's opinions as being those of the Board, and accuses him of mis-

quoting his statements regarding Abbott's *Child at Home*. The argument here is not strong, nor is it important.

Of greater importance are Mann's statements regarding Packard's early letter to Governor Everett, and the account of the interview between Packard and Mann in the latter's rooms in Boston. Concerning the letter to Governor Everett, Mann declares: "I never knew nor heard of that letter before. I have never expressed an opinion of my own that your library books were sectarian, for I am sorry to say, I have not found leisure to read one of the series." This, of course, is not a denial of Packard's statement that Mann had called at the Boston office of the American Sunday School Union and reported the Governor's opinion that the books were sectarian. Mann had regarded the conversation with Packard as unofficial, and had detected nothing in his manner to arouse suspicion. He says:

> When I learned that you were coming to the city, I left an invitation for you to call upon me. You came, and introduced yourself. I was happy to see you. You had before declared to me, that you "had no purpose to promote, which was not common to every good Citizen of our Country." I supposed, you called in order to promote some such *common purpose*. I had no suspicion that it was to fill your quiver with arrows against me, against the Board, against the cause of Education in Massachusetts. I had no suspicion, that what was said in my own room privately, and in confidence was so soon to be divulged in a public assembly. You heard my views without any sign of alarm, or any notice that you should so soon sound one, so that it would reach from one end of the State to the other, among the members of a particular religious denomination, though still to be kept from me. You kept your fears fully from me that night, as you requested the Assembly to keep what you said to them, from the channels which would convey it to me.

Packard had asserted that they had had a "free and full interchange of views for an hour" during which time Mann had said that the mind of the child should not be influenced on the general subject of religious education "until its judgement was suffi-

ciently matured to weigh the evidence, and arguments for itself," and "that the doctrines of revealed religion could not be safely connected with a course of public instruction," etc. Mann in reply, after reminding his opponent that a "full interchange of views" on such a broad subject would be impossible in one hour, continues:

The next point in the statement above quoted, conscience, duty, truth, oblige me to meet with an unqualified denial. I never advanced to you, nor to any mortal, the opinion, that the mind of a child, should not be influenced on religious subjects until its judgement is sufficiently matured to weigh the evidence, and arguments for itself. Such a notion conflicts with my whole theory of the nature, and character of a child's soul. What I said was, that "Creeds," the abstruse points, which divide one set of Christians from another, "ought not to be taught to children." If on this subject, you misunderstood my principal position, how is it possible you should have mistaken my illustration? I compared the sixty, or eighty hostile religious sects into which Christendom is now divided, to the sixty, or eighty conflicting astronomical theories which once prevailed. I said, that had I lived in those times and been intrusted with the education of children, in the branch of Astronomy, I would never have declared to them, that all the motions of the heavenly bodies were infallibly known by me, that I was positively right while all my contemporaries were as positively wrong, (that was the Spirit that imprisoned Galileo for discovering the truth), but that I would deeply have indoctrinated my pupils in Natural and Mechanical Science, in Mathematics, and in Geometry, and then I would have laid open the sixty or eighty theories and left them with their better trained and more impartial minds to make their own selection, with a thousand times better chance of arriving at the truth than I had ever enjoyed. Had not this course been pursued in regard to Astronomy, no doubt we should not have had the Copernican System to this day. Such was my illustration, and my conclusion was, that the Religion of Heaven should be taught to children, while the creeds of men should be postponed until their minds were sufficiently matured to weigh evidence, and arguments. Your next assertion, that I said, *generally, and without exception,* that "the doctrines of revealed religion, could not be safely connected with a course of public instruction," is too erroneous to be credited a moment by any one.

The whole attack seemed to Mann to have been uncalled for, unfair, and calculated to injure the cause to which he had devoted his life. Weighed down by the heavy burden he was carrying, and suffering from the injury Packard had inflicted, he writes:

> But I am weary, and sick of the painful task, while I am writing, it seems to me there is a severity in the mere statement of the facts and the comparison with each other, of your acts, and declarations, that is liable to be mistaken for a severity in my manner of exhibiting them. I will therefore draw this long letter to a close, postponing the residue —I hope forever, at least until some new occasion shall arise for renewing its examination.

Before closing, however, he warns Packard not to repeat his action in using Mann's letters in a public attack coupled with an attempt at secrecy. He eulogizes the members of the Board whose purposes have been called in question, and closes with the suggestion that Packard's sanity ought to be examined before sentence is passed upon him.

Packard's reply, dated September 19, 1838, is a letter of twenty-one closely written pages[12] and is the last of the correspondence. He is not surprised that Mann wishes to avoid controversy; for his construction of the Law of 1827, as expressed in his *First Report,* is "monstrous." The law itself, he says, is "wise, wholesome, necessary"; but Mann's interpretation of it is "forced, mischievous, absurd." The correspondence may be dropped at any time Mann may choose, but discussion of the subject is likely to be continued for some time.

In his defense, first of all, Packard reminds Mann that he has not sustained the charge contained in his letter of inquiry written July 5, that Packard had declared that the Board of Education would recommend for the schools books that were anti-evangelical. This was the accusation contained in Dr. Robbins'

[12] Appendix A, p. 270.

letter, and as it had not been substantiated by Enoch Sanford, Mann had not pressed it.

Packard denies abusing Mann's confidence, but his defense is weak. He insists that the use of the letter at New Bedford was "purely accidental, undesigned and unpremeditated." Of his injunction to secrecy which he attempted to impose upon his hearers at New Bedford, he says nothing and passes by in silence that portion of Mann's letter which refers to it. As in the former letter, he insists he had a right to learn Mann's views and report them. He modifies his statement concerning Mann's views on the "general subject of religious education":

You did say to me in substance, if not *in totidem verbia,* that the mind should be left to judge of religious doctrines for itself & that no influence should be used to bias it on religious subjects, until the judgment is sufficiently matured to weigh the evidence & arguments for itself. You admit that you said that "creeds & abstruse points which divide one sect of Christians from another" ought not to be taught to children—and when you will enumerate these creeds & points it will be found (as I found it) that they embrace any and all points of faith on which any one person in Christendom differs from any other person in Christendom.

You used the illustration about the systems of astronomy—Be assured I neither mistook nor misunderstood it.—And I well remember saying in reply that the illustration was entirely inappropriate, inasmuch as the adoption or rejection of either of those systems involved no such infinite consequences as the adoption or rejection of a plain doctrine of Christianity; and I equally well remember asking you what you would say to your own child who should address you thus:

"Father, I read in the Bible that the wicked shall be turned into hell & all the nations that forget God; and again that the wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment but the righteous into life eternal; and yet I heard Mr. ——— say that there is no hell except that which is endured in this life, and that it is a reproach to God's character to suppose that he is so unmerciful as to punish us forever for the sins of a few short years"—

Would you not tell the child what your own views were; Why you

hold them; & why you thought the opposite views unsound & unscriptural?—You replied emphatically. "No; I would state the different opinions & the grounds of them so far as I knew them, and leave the child's mind to form its own conclusions!"

On this subject you admit, as I said before, all I wish to show & fully establish all my representations. "*The religion of heaven*" should be taught to children, say you, but the "creeds of men" should be postponed until their minds &c.

And pray who but men are to determine what is "the religion of heaven," Does it include the holiness of God, the corruption of the human heart—the sacrifice of Christ for sin—the eternal punishment of the finally impenitent &c. &c.? No, you will say, these belong to the "creeds of men" & must be postponed until the pupil's mind is sufficiently matured to weigh evidence & argument. The "religion of heaven" you will say "is a religion common to all—Its doctrines are revealed in the skies & the flowers, in the ocean & the landscape—These, children can understand—There is nothing in them to confuse & perplex & divide their innocent minds." I know, but imperfectly the principles of this philosophy, but I trust they are too well known in Massachusetts to be long current, unless they are secretly propagated, under official influence, without awakening suspicion.

Packard expresses surprise at Mann's denial of the former's charge that he had said "That the doctrine of revealed religion cannot be safely connected with a course of public instruction" and says:

You certainly made it, more than once, during our conversation. Allow me to ask—Are not the doctrines of revealed religion those which divide Christendom into its "sixty or eighty hostile religious sects," as you express it—? & to keep out these hostile creeds from the public schools of Massachusetts, do you not require *all religious teaching* to be excluded? And "among the vast libraries of books expository of these doctrines have you been able to find one solitary volume which the law (as you expound it) does not exclude from the public schools?" —Surely it would be very inconsistent for you, now, in the face of all this to hold that the doctrines of revealed religion *can be* safely connected with a system of public instruction.

I would ask again—What "doctrines of revealed religion" will remain, to be connected with a system of public instruction, after sub-

tracting those about which there are conflicting creeds among men; which you still admit ought not to be taught to children.—You will be surprised, I think to see the position in which you have placed yourself on this point. So far from my assertion being too enormous to be credited by any one, your denial of it must lead you into a labyrinth of inconsistencies & contradictions from which you would find it impossible to extricate yourself.

No, Sir; the simple truth is disclosed in your report & it will finally be seen in your operations—that your theory of public instruction excludes the doctrines of revealed religion & sends the pupil to the religion of nature as it is called—or to the religion of Socrates & Plato, to learn his origin, character & destiny.

Just what Mr. Mann had said regarding the teaching of revealed religion cannot be determined with certainty from this letter. Packard's references to the *First Report* reveal a misconstruction of its purport that is unfair to Mr. Mann. The language of that Report reads:[13]

The consequence of the enactment, however, has been, that among the vast libraries of books, expository of the doctrines of revealed religion, none have been found, free from that advocacy of particular "tenets" or "sects," which includes them within the scope of the legal prohibition; or at least, no such books have been approved by committees and introduced into the schools. Independently, therefore, of the immeasurable importance of moral teaching, in itself considered, this entire exclusion of religious teaching, though justifiable under the circumstances, enhances and magnifies, a thousand fold, the indispensableness of moral instruction and training.[14]

We have already noted that in pleading for instruction in morality and natural religion, Mann called attention to the exclusion of religious instruction which the Law of 1827 had made necessary because of the lack of books on revealed religion which meet with the requirements of the statute. But Packard accuses Mann himself of this exclusion of religious instruction because of his "monstrous" construction of the law.

[13] See also pp. 41, 42.

[14] *First Report*, p. 62.

Continuing our examination of Packard's letter, we find the following brief paragraph regarding the attempt to secure the Board's recommendation of the Select Library:

I have evidence in my possession that the subject of introducing our library into the public schools of Massachusetts was considered in the Board of Education before our correspondence commenced; & that it was objected to, as *sectarian,* because some of the books inculcate or imply the doctrine of the Trinity—I have no reason to doubt, but every reason to presume, that you were present & participated in that discussion—The subject was before you.

The minutes of the meetings of the Board of Education do not show that this subject was ever discussed; there is no reference to Packard's alleged letter to Governor Everett, nor to the American Sunday School Union, nor to its Select Library. If the question had been submitted and no action taken, however, reference might have been omitted from the minutes, which are not very full.

Packard states that his concern is only with Mann's views, not those of the Board. He insists that he has said nothing and intimated nothing respecting the views of the Board (although he admitted that at New Bedford he had said: "If this class of opinions is to prevail at the Board of Education it becomes ministers of the Gospel and Christian people throughout the Commonwealth, to see to it") and he calls on Mann to avow his principles to the Board of Education. He regards Mann as an incendiary about to destroy the most sacred institutions of Massachusetts, and himself as the watchman who sounds the alarm:

As the representative of a publishing house, I respectfully asked *your* opinion as to the probability that a certain class of books would be circulated in the public schools of Massachusetts, submitting a specimen for your examination. You—the minister of public instruction in that State—decided that they would not be tolerated—& gave your reasons—In doing so you disclosed views on the subject of public education *which I cannot but deem erroneous, unphilosophical, dan-*

gerous & corrupt. Your official connexion with the Board of Education, seemed to me to make the entertainment of these views by you a matter of momentous interest, which none but an infinite mind can comprehend—. If they should become incorporated with the system of instruction about to be established, *under your auspices*, on a firm and durable basis, I cannot doubt that the most sacred institutions & usages of my native State would be uprooted & abolished—And do you think I am bound to hold my peace in such circumstances—Shall I see an incendiary, with torch in hand, approaching the garner in which are deposited the cherished blessings & hopes of many generations, & when he whispers his design to me, shall I not give that alarm —If he is innocent—if he has no such design—if the alarm is groundless, let the responsibility be on me—I mean nothing harsh or unkind by the illustration I use—I would only illustrate my own convictions of the true bearings of the case.

In reviewing what he has done, Packard says that what he has learned of Mann's views has convinced him that "the Christian religion will not be recognized as the basis of the system of public instruction in Massachusetts." This statement, repeatedly made in the closing pages of his letter, was soon to be made the watchword of another attack, in another form, through the medium of the printed page.

CHAPTER VI

Packard Carries the Attack to the Newspapers

THE immediate effect of the affair at New Bedford did not prove to be all that Packard desired. Though such words as his could not fail to arouse the suspicions of many, and were certain to create prejudice and antagonism, yet his success was restricted by three factors: the reply of Dr. Robbins, whose orthodoxy and sincerity none could question; his own attempt to conceal what he had done; and, as Enoch Sanford had noted, the obvious connection between his remarks and his desire to sell his books. Nettled by this experience, and angered by Mann's arraignment of his duplicity, he now carried the attack to the newspapers. Profiting by his experience at New Bedford, he avoided all reference to the Select Library and devoted his energy to attacking Mann and the Board of Education. Whether through fear of the legal ability of Horace Mann which might be directed against him, or because he did not wish to be recognized by his Orthodox readers as the author of the attack at New Bedford, he preferred to write anonymously or to conceal his identity behind a pseudonym.[1]

Mr. Packard began with an article which appeared in the *New York Observer* in the issue of August 18, 1838, with the heading "Triumph of Infidelity," and was signed "Verax."[2] Quoting

[1] Mr. Packard's anonymous authorship is commented upon in two sketches of his life. It should be noted, however, that he signed his name to the letter published in the *New York Observer* and the *Boston Recorder* in which he challenged the authority of the Law of 1827. *Ante*, p. 55. See also Edwin Wilbur Rice: *The Sunday-School Movement, 1780-1917, and the American Sunday-School Union, 1817-1917*, p. 177; George H. Griffin: *Frederick A. Packard, a Memorial Discourse Given in the First Church, Springfield, Sunday Evening, October 19, 1890*, p. 15.

[2] *The New Englander*, 1847, V, 514, attributes this article to the author of the *Four Letters to Dr. Humphrey*. See p. 94.

from Mann's *First Report*, a portion of the paragraph concerning the need for books on morality and natural religion occasioned by the exclusion of books on revealed religion, he says that this is nothing short of a triumph of infidelity, and asserts that it can only be "the artful movement of a few minds hostile to all the great doctrines of the Bible; another of the bold efforts of the day to banish the gospel from the world." If the Board of Education and their Secretary intend to wage war on the vital interests of the human family, their work will only be a curse.

The editor, in a note appended, stated that he wondered if the language of the *Report* did not relate only to the works of uninspired authors. He asked whether the Bible, or at least the New Testament, was not used in many hundreds of schools in Massachusetts. But even if this were not true, he did not believe all the remarks of Verax were sustained by the facts. The family, the Sabbath School, and the Church would still teach religion. In the opinion of the editor, the Law of 1827 was passed, not to prevent teaching religion to children, "but to prevent the teaching of Unitarianism in the public schools, by the authority and at the expense of the State."

The editor's question was immediately answered by two correspondents whose replies appeared in the issues of August 25 and September 8. The first was unimportant. The second letter, occupying a full column, was from a member of a school committee in a large Massachusetts town. It was unsigned. He stated that Verax had fallen into error. The Bible is widely read in the schools of Massachusetts. A careful examination of the school returns shows that some schools are actually using "books containing pieces not only decidedly religious, but decidedly evangelical." The Law of 1827, if strictly enforced, would exclude these. If there are any "artful movements" or "bold efforts to banish the Gospel," why is not this statute enforced? The Board seems surprisingly lenient toward these books if Verax is correct in his statements. The truth is that the Board of Education

has no power to decide what books shall be used in the schools. This is the function of the school committees elected by the people. The limitation imposed by the statute is reasonable and safe. It applies with equal justice to evangelical Christians, Unitarians, and Universalists: "Must not all be equal as to civil and religious rights in the land of freedom?" Verax is wrong. Any such "complete triumph of infidelity" as he imagines would not be tolerated by the sons of the Pilgrims. "Plymouth Rock itself would cry out. The Puritans would speak from their graves." Their descendants would fill the land with remonstrance and lamentation.

That the Board of Education was awake to the importance of the Verax article is seen in the minutes of the meeting of the Board on August 31, 1838—the same day that the letter of resignation from E. A. Newton was read. Mr. Mann read the article to the Board, and it was referred to the committee consisting of Dr. Davis, Dr. Robbins, and Dr. Putnam—the same committee to whom was referred the Newton letter of resignation. Their report, entered in the minutes just following the report on the Newton communication, briefly records "that no further action was necessary."

In the *New York Observer's* issue of October 20, 1838, there appeared the first of a series of unsigned letters "On Common Schools" addressed to "The Rev. President Humphrey, of Amherst College."[3] As we shall have occasion presently to examine this letter more in detail, the briefest account of its contents will suffice at this point. The writer reviews the organization of the Board of Education in Massachusetts, its functions, and those of its Secretary. Though their power seems to be advisory merely, and quite limited, it is in reality much greater than appears. Care must be taken to make sure that the right men are

[3] Presumably the address to Dr. Humphrey, whose orthodoxy was well known, was due to the fact that in the previous issue of the *New York Observer* he had begun a series of articles on the subject: "Thoughts on Education."

intrusted with this power, and they must be watched "with sleepless vigilance." In closing, attention is invited to a discussion, to be considered in succeeding letters, of the question: "Will the Christian religion be recognized by your Board as the basis of the system of public instruction?"

Horace Mann's comment in his Journal upon the new attack, dated October 27, 1838, gives briefly his opinion of the type of Orthodoxy that had attacked the cause of education at New Bedford, and speaks his own determination to fight:

Last Saturday there appeared in the "New York Observer" the first of a series of articles against the Massachusetts Board of Education, and probably their Secretary, professing to inquire into the bearings of the action of the Board in regard to religious teaching in the schools. They are addressed to Dr. Humphreys [*sic*]. Probably they will have no difficulty in making out that the Board is irreligious; for with them religion is synonymous with Calvin's five points. As for St. James's definition of it, "Pure religion and undefiled is to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction," &c.; and that other definition, "Do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with thy God,"—the Orthodox have quite outgrown these obsolete notions, and have got a religion which can at once gratify their self-esteem and destructiveness. They shall not unclinch me from my labors for mankind.

That the new attack was not unexpected, and that there was also "vigilance" on the part of the Board, is seen in the following letter from Dr. Emerson Davis, the Orthodox minister of the Congregational church at Westfield:

Westfield. Oct. 24, 1838. Hon. H. Mann, Dear Sir. The first letter of the anticipated series appeared in the N. York Observer of Saturday last. I wrote to the Editor on Monday informing him that friends had given us notice of what might be expected—intimated that I knew the origin, & the object of the letters & that it would be in season to criticise & expose the faults of the Mass. Board after they had performed some act; or published some sentiments which could be brought for proof against them. I asked the Editor if the bearing of the Letters was not to prejudice the community against the Board, & to throw an obstacle in their way; & desired them to consider whether

on the whole, the public good did not require the suppression of the remaining Numbers. What will be the result, I cannot say.

The Editors published an Editorial article against a national or state religion for schools. They expressed views that accord well with the general sentiments of the Board.

The letters are addressed to Dr. Humphrey Presid. of Amh. Coll. If the series go on, we must persuade the Dr. to answer *on the right side*—I am somewhat afraid of him however, Newton has conversed with him, & I am suspicious that he had some influence over Newton, & aroused his fears—We must get somebody to convert the Dr., or be ready to reply before he shall have an opportunity.

* * * * *

It is said that you may know a good apple-tree by the number of clubs & stones that lay about it. I think our tree will have this sort of evidence to prove that its fruit is good—Be not discouraged—The flag is nailed to the mast & I shall not stop until popular Education rises in Mass.—let the success of enemies be what it may. Yours Respectfully, Emerson Davis.

The editorial policy of the *New York Observer* was opposed to state interference for the purpose of teaching religion in the public schools. The editorial referred to by Davis had appeared in the issue of October 20, 1838, under the heading: "Religious Establishments." The writer argued that the state had no more authority to establish by law the teaching of religion in the schools, than to establish a state religion in the churches. Pointing out the difficulty in deciding what could be taught while avoiding sectarianism, the writer held that the effect of teaching the elements common to all Christian sects would be to favor "the lowest, and least religious form of Unitarianism." He preferred to leave the matter to the decision of each district.

The appeal to the *Observer* brought immediate results and the series of letters to Dr. Humphrey was suppressed after two letters had been published. Dr. Davis' letter to Mann, reporting their suppression, reveals a man who is conscious of his own honesty of purpose:

Westfield. Nov. 15, 1838. Hon. H. Mann. Sir. The Editors of the

Observer have published none of the offensive Letters since their receipt of mine, except the 2nd which probably was then struck off. I am inclined to think they will publish no more at present. Dr. Humphrey commenced a series of Nos in the same paper about the time Packard began, which he calls his Thoughts on Education. I suppose we shall have his Thoughts respecting our Board before he gets through. I presume Calhoun will write the Dr. on the subject next week. If he does I think we shall keep things still, until the Board and its Secretary get their 2nd Reports before the public—& we must insert something in each of these Reports, that will disarm our opponents, & convince the people of Mass., that we are honest men, that we have no secret design of destroying either their civil or religious Liberty.

I should think you ought to introduce into your Report, something equivalent to your remarks on the importance of Moral Instruction contained in your last address—& the Board may publish something like the resolve adopted at the last meeting & perhaps pass a Resolution at the next meeting recommending the use of the Bible in all the Schools, which might be published in the Com. School Journal—By some such process I think we may outride the storms—

* * * * *

Your friend & humble servt. E. Davis.

Calhoun, mentioned by Dr. Davis, was Hon. William B. Calhoun, Representative in Congress from Springfield, Massachusetts. His letter to Mann, written November 20, suggested that the seed sown by Packard was beginning to take root:

Spfd. Nov. 20, 1838. My Dear Sir. I have consulted with Mr. Davis upon the subject of your letter of the 9th inst. He has referred me to all the articles in the Observer. I am sure there can be no real difficulty in the way in such a community as ours of Massts. I intend, however, to write to Dr. Humphrey: his answer I will communicate to you.

I have just seen very accidentally some editorial remarks in the Boston Recorder—the last one—upon the same topic; the amount of which is, that the B. of Ed. ought only to *recommend* their Selection of books—that in that case all will be well enough. This perhaps comes from the same source with the Observer articles—or originated there.

It seems to me very unmanly to cavil before your selection makes its appearance.

We have had some excellent Conventions in Hampden in reference to the schools. I think the coming year will show a very difft. state of feeling upon the subject from what has heretofore existed. Faithfully yours. W. B. Calhoun

Dr. Humphrey's reply shows that he not only had not been a party to the attack, but that he did not know the source of the anonymous letters. Although thoroughly orthodox, he considered it only fair to reserve judgment until the Board's choice of books should be announced.

Am. Coll. Nov. 22, 1838. Hon. Wm. B. Calhoun, Dear Sir, I agree with you entirely, that the cause of popular education in this Commonwealth, is a noble cause; & that whoever is willing to labor for its advancement, judiciously & fairly, is entitled to public confidence & coöperation. I regret that I have not had opportunity to hear the Secretary of the Board, when he has been in this county, as I understand his addresses have given great satisfaction.

I have, I confess, thought from the beginning, that any Board of Education, would find it an extremely delicate task, to make an acceptable selection of school Books, on account of the conflicting religious opinions which prevail in our State; & the late meeting in Boston, has strengthened that opinion. What Books the Board will recommend, we cannot of course know, until the list is announced, and then, as you suggest, will be the proper time for objection & criticism.

In regard to the letters addressed to me, in the N. Y. Observer, of which you speak, I do not know who the writer is, nor where he resides; & whether his animadversions & warnings have produced much effect I am unable to say.

* * * * *

I am, Dear Sir, with great respect your obedt svt H. Humphrey.

The "late meeting in Boston" was an educational convention reported in the *Boston Recorder,* November 9, 1838. One speaker, Rev. Mr. Blagden, minister of the Old South Church,

had favored the teaching of religion "in its liberal but not unevangelical sense." Rev. Mr. Pierpont, of Hollis Street Church, would avoid sectarianism. Neither he nor Mr. Blagden, he was sure would consent to that. He would have the children taught "to reverence God; to reverence his laws; to do right; and to observe the eternal laws of equity in their feelings & actions." Hon. Jonathan Phillips believed the committee on Education, which was embarrassed by the difficulty of the situation, had gone as far as they could. Rev. Nehemiah Adams said the Board's course was a very difficult one. To avoid all jealousies it would be necessary to banish all religion from the schools, yet he hoped that would not be necessary.

Calhoun, in his letter of November 20, referred to an editorial in the *Boston Recorder* and suggested that it might have originated with the author of the letters to Dr. Humphrey. Evidence to prove this authorship is lacking, though, as we shall presently find, the charge was soon to be made that this and other articles were inspired by this origin. The attitude of hostility now assumed by the *Recorder* was maintained throughout Mr. Mann's secretaryship. The article mentioned by Calhoun appeared in the issue of November 16, 1838. It was a review of an article in the *North American Review,* October, 1838, "Remarks on Education," by Robert Rantoul, Jr. Mr. Rantoul was the Democratic member of the Board of Education. The reviewer goes out of his way to express a fear that the Board will try to force the districts to use the Library it is recommending, by making its use a condition of receiving the money authorized by the Law of 1837, to be expended for school libraries.[4] The writer professes not to believe that the Board will attempt this, but continues, "we have heard strong surmises that this was their purpose." Such an article could scarcely be

[4] The writer was evidently not familiar with the Law of 1837, which merely granted authority to the districts to raise money by taxation for libraries. The legislative grants for libraries were not made until 1842.

calculated to inspire confidence in the Board on the part of the public.

The *Recorder's* next thrust was an editorial on the first number of the *Common School Journal,* which had appeared in November, 1838. It will be remembered that this magazine was edited by Mr. Mann in the interest of education and published as a private enterprise. The first issue contained a prospectus and an editorial setting forth, among other things, the policy of the paper with reference to religion. Mr. Mann states that it is his intention to avoid any discussion of sectarian doctrines. The points on which Christians differ are far less numerous than those on which they agree, and belief in these commonly accepted points is the best preparation for the addition of those "distinctive particulars, deemed necessary to a complete and perfect faith." A work on education which failed to recognize that we were created to be religious beings, would be like a human body without a heart. The Protestant liberty of choice is enjoyed by all in the community,—each may freely hold the doctrines he deems to be true. The columns of the *Common School Journal* will not be open to doctrinal discussion, however; for the purpose of the magazine is rather to teach "the great principles of love to God and love to man on which 'hang all the law and the prophets.' "[5]

In the issue of December 28, 1838, the *Boston Recorder,* commenting editorially on this statement of policy, called for an "explanation of the much used term *'Sectarianism,'* " and for a better understanding of the full import of the Board's position. The writer says, "As commonly used, the term strikes *us,* as synonymous with *Spiritual Religion*—and the avoidance of sectarianism means nothing more nor less, than the avoidance of everything pertaining distinctively to Christianity." He hopes the Board will avoid the "falsely styled *liberality* which places the religion of the Bible and the religion of nature on an

[5] *Common School Journal,* vol. I, no. 1, p. 14.

equality." The editor is ashamed of the "pusillanimity . . . that leads many of the friends of Christ to acquiesce in the hue and cry raised by infidels of various classes, against all religion in school books as sectarian." But this is by no means universal. There is a strong tide of feeling commencing in opposition to this attitude, and there are not a few "who will not be satisfied with periodical papers, nor with standard volumes, that exclude from their pages the great and distinguishing truths of Divine revelation." The Bible must be the basis of education, and revealed religion must be included in the curriculum. Evangelical motives influenced the forefathers who founded the Massachusetts schools and determined what should be taught in them. The chief cause of the deplored loss of interest in the common schools is due to the almost complete separation of religion and the Bible from them. Not enough care has been taken to choose religious men for instructors. Good men have been too ready to admit that everything pertaining to religion is sectarian, even to read the Bible, to pray, and to teach the children to fear God and keep his commandments. The sort of sectarianism that ridicules the distinctive teachings of denominations should be avoided. But all of the Board's labors will be of little or no avail if the religion of the Bible—the great fundamental truths of Christianity—be shut out of view in the authorized publications of the Board.

At this juncture, just at the end of the year, the "Letters to Dr. Humphrey," which had been begun in the *New York Observer* in October and suppressed after two installments had been printed, made their appearance in Boston. There were four of the letters, published in a pamphlet of twenty-five pages.[6] They were anonymous, though the writer attempted to give them

[6] *The Question, Will the Christian Religion Be Recognized as the Basis of the System of Public Instruction in Massachusetts? Discussed in Four Letters to the Rev. Dr. Humphrey, President of Amherst College.* A copy is in the Yale University Library.

the appearance of being part of an actual correspondence by using a salutation and by closing the last two letters with the expression, "Yours &c."

The *Four Letters* are reminiscent of Packard's correspondence with Mann and the "Verax" article. The writer has read the *First Report*. The Board is evidently taking hold of the subject in good earnest. But the powers conferred upon the Board are much greater than would appear from the terms of the act defining them: "To make such a plan acceptable to the people, in these jealous times, it must *seem* to embrace very harmless duties." Collecting and disseminating information, preparing reports and occasionally *recommending* to the legislature measures needed, may all be very well; "but I need not tell you how far above and beyond all this, will be the *silent and unseen influence of this Board* on everything affecting the interests of the schools." Their influence will control all other influences in the selection of teachers, the preparation and introduction of books, the determination of principles of teaching adopted, etc. Great care must therefore be observed in the selection of those to whom is intrusted this "invisible all-controlling influence," and when selected, they must be watched with "sleepless vigilance." Perhaps some people suppose the Christian religion is still the basis of instruction in the schools, and that this order of things is secure. But a glance at the Report of the Secretary of the Board will show the present situation and reveal how difficult it will be to restore the old order. The writer then quotes the paragraph from the *Report* (pp. 60-61) regarding textbooks and emphasizes Mann's words by capitalizing: "THIS ENTIRE EXCLUSION OF RELIGIOUS TEACHING, THOUGH JUSTIFIABLE UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES, enhances and magnifies a thousandfold, the indispensableness of moral instruction and training." But the law requires teachers "to impress on the minds of children and youth committed to their care and instruction, the *principles of*

piety," etc. Therefore the law is self-contradictory if all religious teaching is to be excluded. Granted that sectarian teaching must be excluded from the schoolbooks, the successive teachers are at liberty to inculcate hostile creeds notwithstanding. But with regard to schoolbooks, there is a wide difference between one "calculated to favor some particular sect or tenet" and one from which all religion is excluded. The framers of the law never contemplated such a "monstrous construction," nor will the people of Massachusetts allow it. The main purpose of these letters is to urge the good people of all parties and denominations, especially the clergy, to unite and "put down this new-fangled philosophy of education." The majority must govern; if Universalists and Unitarians, or deists and infidels are in the majority, let them control. It is evident that under the present plan the Christian religion—the religion revealed in the Holy Scriptures—cannot be the basis of instruction in the public schools; "but instead of it, a system of 'ethics and natural religion,' such as enlightened the age of Socrates and Plato."

The author of the *Four Letters* was Frederick A. Packard, Secretary of the American Sunday School Union in Philadelphia. This is proven not only by the context, which shows striking similarity to Packard's previous articles advertising the Select Library, and to his letters to Mann, and by numerous references, more or less veiled, which, as we shall see, point to him as author; but also by Mann's own statement in a letter to Dr. Richard S. Storrs of Braintree, dated January 19, 1839, shortly to be quoted, and by the repeated and uncontradicted public attribution of these letters to Packard by the *Trumpet and Universalist Magazine,* whose articles we shall presently review.

The system of coöperation which appears to have been worked out between Packard and his willing agent, the *Boston Recorder,* was admirable. The appearance of the *Four Letters* was the signal for a review of them in the issue of January 11, 1839. The writer is charitable as he calls the attention of his

readers to the pamphlet. He wonders if the author is not too hard on the Secretary of the Board of Education. He is unwilling to believe that it is Mr. Mann's intention to exclude the religion of the Bible from the schools. Apparently forgetting New Bedford and the seed sown there, he strangely enough finds himself obliged to admit that a simple perusal of the documents of the Board, "before any public discussions have been had," has caused suspicions to spring up in all parts of the Commonwealth,—a fact which is "strong presumptive evidence that they are not wholly without foundation." He believes that Mr. Mann is "*honest* in his interpretation of the Statute of 1826," but he is "pained that the Board have so far committed themselves, inadvertently as we believe, to . . . the false and fatal principle that the common schools can flourish and accomplish the end they aim at without the aids of Christianity." He is "*pained* also at the indication of the state of public sentiment, furnished by the fact, that the members of the Board, who are known and accredited as evangelical in doctrine as well as practice, have not withstood the evils that now threaten." He urges his readers to give these *Letters* a thorough and candid examination.

In the same issue there appeared the first of five letters addressed to Mr. Mann, and signed "Clericus Hampdenensis."[7] This writer has decided objections to giving to the Board any power even to recommend books for use in the schools. He fears this power might become a mighty engine in favor of some sect. In subsequent letters the writer states that he agrees with Mann's construction of the Law of 1827, but says this is a union of Church and State wherein the State is attempting to dictate and control the religion of the people. The majority in any town must decide what religion shall be taught in the schools,—it may even introduce the Assembly's Shorter Catechism. He calls on the people of the State to repeal this "obnoxious Section,"

[7] *Boston Recorder,* January 11, 25, February 8, March 1, 22, 1839.

which is also embarrassing the Secretary of the Board, and makes a plea for the Bible in the schools:

The Bible—in the naked simplicity of its annunciations;—the Bible—unwarped, undiluted by sectarian expositions; the Bible, insisting on the great facts of man's moral ruin, of his need of a Redeemer, of regeneration and sanctification to fit him for the highest measure of usefulness on earth, and for the holy employments of the redeemed in heaven—should be daily and thoroughly taught in the schools.

Such a series of assaults, directed to stir up religious prejudice, must be met. Horace Mann was wise enough to recognize in all of this an attempt to draw himself and the Board into a public controversy. The Board might choose to reply, and meet the attacks in an impersonal manner; but he knew that a personal controversy at this time must be avoided.[8] Conscious of his own integrity, and the Board's entire sincerity, he believed that truth would triumph over falsehood and win the confidence of any fair and honest mind. He therefore sought to disarm opposition by a direct appeal, and wrote the following letter:

Boston, Jan. 19, 1839. Rev. Dr. Storrs. Dear Sir,—Three days ago, I met my friend Mr. Louis Dwight; when our conversation turned upon the strictures lately made, in the "Boston Recorder" upon the Board of Education and myself.

I said to Mr. Dwight that those animadversions were without a shadow of foundation; that they were cruel; that they were making my labors, already greater than I feel able to perform, still more arduous and anxious. Yesterday, Mr. Dwight was kind enough to call on me with Mr. Willis, the editor. The latter opened the subject of the articles in a very proper spirit and manner, and professed a desire to have any misapprehension rectified. I referred him to the extraordinary meaning which had been forced upon the word "sectarianism" in the prospectus of the "Common-school Journal"; to the declaration of the existence of ground for suspicion that I had "matured in my

[8] In the *Twelfth Report* Mann states that he tried to induce the Board to answer these attacks; but the Board, knowing the charges to be groundless, deemed it best not to give to them the undeserved importance which a formal reply would bestow. *Twelfth Report*, pp. 114, 115.

own mind and deliberately resolved on a plan for the exclusion of the religion of the Bible from our schools"; to the further declaration, that a simple perusal of the documents of the Board has caused suspicions to spring up in all parts of the Commonwealth that such a plan was concerted; and that the "mere existence of the suspicions was strong presumptive evidence that they were not wholly without foundation"; and what was perhaps worst of all in its natural effects, an expression, made in an apparent spirit of charity, of a strong inclination to believe that the Secretary is *honest* in his belief that the Board of Education cannot, without violation of law, allow books that treat on religious subjects to be placed on the desks of our schoolrooms. I then stated to him that the Board had never published any document authorizing the slightest suspicion, either against themselves or against me, like the one here referred to; that, so far from my entertaining a belief that it would be illegal to have any books treating of religious subjects on the desks of the schoolrooms, the very contrary was one of the most prominent points in my Report of last year, wherein I had at once exposed and deplored the absence of moral and religious instruction in our schools, and had alleged the probable reason for it; viz., that school committees had not found books, expository of the doctrines of revealed religion, which were not also denominational, and therefore, in their view, within the law, and not that books which did not infringe the law should be excluded.

He then told me that you were the author of these articles; and both he and Mr. Dwight seemed desirous that I should address you a note on the subject, and send you a copy of the only document which has yet been published by the Board;—they supposing that you had been misled by the letters of Packard addressed to Dr. Humphrey, which letters were instigated because the Board and myself would not become instrumental in introducing the American Sunday School Union Secretary's Library into our common schools.

Allow me to say, sir, that, by an examination of the school law, you will see that the Board have no authority, direct or indirect, over schoolbooks; that you will see, by a letter addressed to me by name, a week ago, through the columns of the "Recorder," that a jealousy exists among your religious friends, even of a recommendation of school-books by the Board.[9] I will also state, that by the rules and regulations for the government of Normal schools, *where the Board*

[9] B. Pickman Mann, in the bibliography prepared for the *Report of the United States Commissioner of Education* for 1895-1896 (p. 898), attributes the

has power, they had decided, before the appearance of Packard's wicked pamphlet, that the principles of piety and morality common to all sects of Christians should be taught in every Normal school, and that a portion of the Scriptures should be daily read.

I hope, sir, that my motives in writing this letter may be justly appreciated. I loathe controversy, especially at a time when the efforts of every good man are necessary in the work of improvement. I have no spirit for controversy, nor time nor strength to devote to it. To exclude all chance of my being involved in it, I must beg you to consider this letter as confidential, except so far as it regards Mr. Willis and Mr. Dwight, at whose request it is written. Yours very respectfully, Horace Mann.

P.S.—The "Trumpet" directly and repeatedly has charged the Board with the intention to introduce religion into the schools, from the same evidence which others interpret so differently.[10]

This letter clearly proves that Packard was the author of the *Four Letters,* and that Storrs[11] was the author of the *Recorder's* editorial on the first number of the *Common School Journal,* and of the review of Packard's *Four Letters*. Mrs. Mann, in introducing this letter in the *Life,* says that "Mr. Storrs was ever afterwards a cordial friend." Dr. Storrs' reply, which was not published, bears the marks of sincerity of conviction, though some trivial details, such as the reference to the printers, are given undue emphasis:

Braintree Feb. 20, 1839. Hon. Horace Mann: My dear Sir: Yours of the 19th *ult.* was duly recd. and read with much interest. As it did not seem to demand a reply, but only a suspension of my own movements for a season, I did not think it worth while to trouble you at all

"Clericus Hampdenensis" letters to Storrs; but this is evidently a mistake, as the context of Mann's letter shows.

[10] I quote from the original letter preserved in the "Mann Papers." Mrs. Mann's copy, which was published in the *Life* in 1865 (p. 109) omitted Packard's name, doubtless because he was still living at that time.

[11] Rev. Richard Salter Storrs, D.D. (1787-1878). He was ordained pastor of the First Church in Braintree, Mass., July 11, 1811, and served in that capacity sixty-two years. He was among the first clergymen to refuse to exchange pulpits with those of liberal views. See also William S. Pattee: *A History of Old Braintree and Quincy,* p. 286.

with an answer *then*. Subsequently however, I prepared a brief article for the Recorder, whh at the earnest request of Mr. L. Dwight, was not inserted—under the assurance that the forthcoming Report of the Board of Education would clear away all clouds, and set everything right in the eyes even of "orthodox prejudice"! That Report, thro' your kindness has come to hand, and you will please accept my very grateful acknowledgments for the attention, and also for the high gratification afforded by the whole document.

Still, I feel myself bound to say, respectfully but frankly, that my views of the bearing of the whole system of procedure on the part of the Board of Education, remain unchanged. You will do me the justice to believe me, when I say further, that I look on each individual member of the Board, as well as yourself, with none other than sentiments of the highest respect, and do not question at all, but each man in his station is acting with all good conscience toward God and the Commonwealth. Nor is *my heart* cold on that object of surpassing grandeur whh so fills *your* eye and soul—the elevation and perfection of our Common School System—it is an object very dear to me, as all who know my stile of address on the subject in every situation, will probably bear witness. 24303

My difficulties are not with *men,* but with principles.

Will you allow me to say, my dear Sir, that I have no confidence in the ultimate success of any project for the intellectual and moral improvement of our youth, which is not based on the religion of the Bible? And will you allow me to say further, that by the religion of the Bible, I mean the kernel, not the shell—the substance, not the shadow? Those there are, as you are well aware, who profess great veneration for the Bible, and talk much of piety, and of the dignity and even innocency of human nature, while they treat with great contumely every doctrine regarded by others as essential to the Christian system. I have no wish to judge their motives, nor their hearts. To their own Master they stand or fall. But, to *my* mind, the conviction is strong and clear, that their respect for the Bible is not such, as to give it great influence over *them,* nor over others *through* them. I would not undervalue the *slightest* homage paid to the Scriptures of truth—neither would I deceive myself with the vain imagination, that any other than a sincere and thoro' respect for them in the whole circle of their instructions, will render them permanently influential in forming the moral and intellectual character of [the] community.

The "Board" have required that a portion of the Scriptures be daily

read in the Normal Schools. Good. But, it is *not* required that it be read by the *scholars*—it is not made a "reading book" for the school. The *instructor* may read one, five, ten, or fifty verses at his option, and your requisition is complied with. No *prayer* is required. No attention to the Sabbath or the Sanctuary is required. You conceive all this to lie beyond your province. Perhaps it is so. But so much the worse. The *plan* cannot succeed. God will blow upon it. I do not criminate *you,* my dear Sir, nor the Board; but the *authority,* wherever it lies, whether in the Board, Legislature, or mass of the people, that conflicts with the authority of *God,* will come to naught;—and in this case there is such a conflict;—and not all the wealth, learning nor power of Mass. can command success for your otherwise noble enterprise.

My dear Sir: be assured it grieves *me,* to find myself and my brethren at large under the necessity of doing or saying anything, that can add aught to the burdens of your highly responsible and thankless office. But, we must be faithful to *God.* And we must be faithful to our sense of duty, come what will. On this ground we stand. And tho' heaven and earth pass away, on this ground we shall still stand: not to oppose you—but to oppose a fundamental error—to vindicate the honor of the God of the Bible, and the Savior of the world, against any and all influence, that would elevate intellectual improvement above Christian instruction.

Let me beg you, Sir, to look at the composition of your Board—all, men of intelligence, and great moral worth—all but three of them however, men selected from that denomination, which has done all in its power to crush orthodoxy throughout the Commonwealth, wresting from it meetinghouses, funds, chh furniture &c &c under color of law; —and the three orthodox men in the Board, at remote points in the State, where their influence, if they *wished* to oppose any measure proposed, could hardly be *felt* at all, in the Board. Your locations of the Normal Schools are in the most thoro'ly Unitarian towns in the Commonwealth. Your *printers* are Unitarians. Every thing indicates *design*—somewhere—I say *not,* in the Board—but *somewhere*—a design to supplant the religion of the Bible as I hold it, and as the great majority of friends to common schools hold it.

You will excuse my frankness. I do not write, I have not written one word with an unkind feeling. I could fill sheets—but I have not time. You have my heart—and with it, the heart of 300 ministers of Christ in this Commonwealth. It is thrown open without reserve, because I *know* you to be an honorable man, and because I wish to ap-

prize you distinctly of facts that Bro. Fay & Bro. Dwight do not know the existence of, and because I wish you distinctly to understand the course, that conscience & the love of God compel me to pursue. With the best respects, I remain Yours &c R. S. Storrs.

P.S. You will of course regard this as "confidential"—for tho' I *can* have no objection to your making known anywhere the views that will probably come out sooner or later under my own proper signature, yet I have been compelled to write in great haste, and without regard to anything, but simply a conveyance of my tho'ts. R.S.S.

We shall presently consider in some detail the Board's plan and purpose in founding the normal schools, and shall therefore reserve comment upon Dr. Storrs' reference to them at this point. His criticism that all but three members of the Board were Unitarian was a just one, and gave ground for suspicion. The best answer to the accusation of design in the matter, however, is the fact that subsequent appointments gave to the Board a majority of Orthodox members.[12] That the three Orthodox members lived some distance from Boston does not appear to have been an undue handicap. Newton took but little interest in the work of the Board from the beginning; but the minutes of the Board meetings show that the other two were among the most active of the entire group.

That such attacks as Packard's *Four Letters* and the *Boston Recorder* articles should be allowed to go unanswered in Boston was, of course, impossible. Although Horace Mann avoided controversy and devoted his attention to the exacting labors of his mission, speaking clearly and positively in his reports and his lectures, friends were not wanting, among Orthodox and Liberals alike, to answer the enemy and bring his motives to light. It is interesting to find the first reply in the columns of the *Boston Recorder* itself. The interview with the editor, Mr. Willis, reported in Mann's letter to Storrs, resulted thus happily for the time being, though the subsequent attitude of that paper

[12] See also *The Common School Controversy, etc.*, p. 27.

compels us to question the lasting quality of the editor's conversion, if indeed there ever was any real change of attitude.

In the *Boston Recorder's* issue of January 25, 1839, a writer who signed himself "Y-Z" said that if he had no information on the subject except that gained from the *Four Letters* he would think there was cause for alarm. Such was not the case, however, for we read:

> But knowing, as I do, something of the authorship, and of the origin of the Four Letters, they come from a citizen of another state, and that nearly all the notes of alarm, that have been sounded apparently from many quarters, have proceeded from the same source, I have not the anxiety which I otherwise might have. For several months past an influence has issued from a certain quarter, and has been exerted in diverse ways, which bears on its front the marks of a commendable zeal for the purity of our religious institutions, while it is too apparent that motives of a more earthly character, are the impelling power. The author of all these exciting insinuations seeks concealment; he knows probably, that when several threats come in the dark from different quarters, it seems to us that we are assailed by many individuals. I would not throw off the covering, and expose him unnecessarily to the public gaze. It seems however, very desirable, that so much as I have now said should be known by the public, else they might infer that the author of the Four Letters knew something of the plans and purposes of the Board of Education or their Secretary, that is unknown to others.

The writer added that he was making this communication on his own responsibility, not as the hired apologist or defender of the Board and their Secretary.

Three days later, a communication signed "An Observer" appeared in the *Daily Advertiser and Patriot* of Boston. The writer is pleased with the growing interest in common school education, but regrets that "a few individuals" are attempting to excite suspicion and hinder the work of the Board of Education and their Secretary by "imputing to them, at least by implication, the design of introducing infidelity into our Town

Schools!" After briefly reviewing the attack, and expressing the belief that the Board favors religious instruction, the writer asks:

> But why then this complaint? Why are certain papers from week to week attempting to excite the people on this subject? The truth ought to be known. Certain individuals *out of the State,* have books which they wish to introduce into our schools, and they fear that the views of the Board of Education will be in their way. This is the origin of all that we hear on the subject. In this charge of infidelity, in this attempt to impair the usefulness of the Secretary of the Board, we are confident, that the Orthodox, as a sect, do not sympathize. They are, we believe, reasonable men, and have no desire to introduce their distinctive views into our public schools. The high minded gentlemen of that sect on the Board of Education, ask no more for themselves than they are willing to accord to others; and we trust that is the sentiment of the class of Christians they represent. We do not believe that that enlightened sect are disposed to follow up an insinuation in a recent pamphlet, that this question should be carried into popular elections, and be decided at the polls. Advice like this may be given by an inhabitant of a neighboring State, but we are confident that it will meet with no response from the enlightened Orthodox of Massachusetts.

The writer is confident, however, that, should he be mistaken, if the question should be submitted to the people, the result would be a repudiation of the proposal to introduce sectarian teaching into the schools.

To these anonymous newspaper replies, there were now added open words of defense of the Board and Mr. Mann, the speakers being Rev. Warren Fay, an Orthodox Congregational minister, and Rev. O. H. Dodge, a Baptist minister. It will be remembered that in Dr. Robbins' account of Packard's assault at New Bedford, it was stated that Rev. Mr. Fay of Charlestown had been instrumental in getting him to reply to Packard. It is interesting to note that Dr. Fay,[13] who was pastor of the First Church (Trinitarian Congregational) in Charlestown (1820-

[13] James F. Hunnewell: *A Century of Town Life: A History of Charlestown, Massachusetts, 1775-1887,* pp. 41, 189.

1839), was the successor of Dr. Jedediah Morse, whose part in the Unitarian controversy we have elsewhere considered. At a meeting of the Middlesex County Association for the Improvement of Common Schools, held in Charlestown January 24, 1839, Dr. Fay submitted the following resolution:[14]

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Board of Education, in the development of their plans and measures, have not, in the opinion of this Association, interfered with the rights, or intermeddled with the differences of the different religious sects or political parties in the Commonwealth;—but have pursued an enlightened and impartial course, which entitles them to the support and confidence of the friends of Education.

In presenting this resolution, Dr. Fay gave his reasons for doing so. The religious paper of one denomination had charged the Board with intention to introduce sectarian religion into the schools, while that of another complained that religion was to be excluded. Both could not be true. If the Board were innocent, jealousy against them ought not to be excited. All parties should give them their united support. Fair and candid men ought to check the increase of jealousies. Such an expression by the Association as the resolution offered would help to allay groundless apprehensions. Until the Board should attempt to introduce sectarianism, or rule out the Bible, it was unfair to scatter suspicion of their conduct, to discourage them, and injure their influence. He had full confidence in them and believed they should be treated fairly.

The resolution was supported by several speakers, among whom was Rev. O. H. Dodge,[15] pastor of the Baptist church

[14] *Common School Journal,* I, 61, 62.

[15] Rev. O. H. Dodge was ordained pastor of the Baptist church in Lexington in January, 1835. He was a member of the school committee, 1838-1840. He died May 18, 1840. The church record reads: "To a mind naturally shrewd, penetrating, and highly cultivated, he added a warm-hearted piety and an unwavering activity. Beloved by the church and respected by all, he died universally lamented."—Charles Hudson: *A History of the Town of Lexington, Middlesex*

in Lexington, who rejoiced that the resolution had been offered. He was especially glad that it had come from "a gentleman, so well known and so much respected in one of the religious denominations, from which attempts to excite suspicions had proceeded." He had not complained that no Baptist had been included in the membership of the original Board. From the beginning he had watched the movements of the Board, and recently because of the proposed measure to establish a normal school at Lexington, he had "inquired into and reviewed their whole course." He was convinced that there was not only no ground for opposition, but that "they were entitled to the gratitude of the community." Referring to the pamphlet which had aroused some suspicions, he said that "its origin and motive were now well understood. It seized upon a single expression in the Report of the Secretary of the Board—cut it out from its connection, and perverted it, and founded its whole charge upon the perversion, while the very paragraph from which it was taken, contained a refutation of the charge."[16]

In the postscript to Mann's letter to Dr. Storrs, he reminded him that the *Trumpet* had repeatedly charged the Board with

County, Massachusetts, from its First Settlement to 1868, with a Genealogical Register of Lexington Families, p. 362.

Horace Mann's appreciation of Mr. Dodge is noted in an entry in his Journal dated May 23, 1840: "I have heard today that my friend Mr. Dodge, the Baptist clergyman of Lexington is in a rapid decline, & that probably nothing can save him. This is indeed mournful, so young, so useful, so excellent a man,—saint-like true to his own faith yet tolerant of others, so anxious for the prevalence of good, that he is careless from what source it emanates, with a mind large enough to be able to comprehend that there may be honest differences of opinion, & conscientious enough to be just to others, when his predilections may be against them. A rare example of liberality, ingenuousness, truth-loving among the orthodox, who generally bear about the same relations to the great truths they criticize, which the fly did to the column whose proportions he condemned."

[16] Quotations from the *Common School Journal*, I, 61, 62. A report of this convention is found in the Boston *Daily Advertiser and Patriot*, issue of February 26, 1839, in an article entitled "The Recent Attacks on the Board of Education." The writer reviews and condemns the *Four Letters*. The article closes with a striking review of Mr. Mann's previous record of public service in the interest of humanity, and an expression of the fullest confidence in him and the Board.

intending to introduce religious instruction into the schools. Dr. Fay, in his defense of the Board at the Middlesex convention, alluded to the same charge. The paper referred to was the *Trumpet and Universalist Magazine,* published in Boston. The effect of Packard's *Four Letters* upon the attitude of this paper is striking. In the issue of November 17, 1838, the fear was expressed that the new movement in education, with its proposal to teach religion in the public schools, would lead to teaching sectarian religion. Quotations in support of this contention were made from the addresses of various speakers in the recent Suffolk County common school convention held in Park Street Church. A second article appeared in the same paper two weeks later, December 1, when Mann's editorial in the first number of the *Common School Journal,* announcing a non-sectarian policy, was quoted to show that it was the Board's purpose to teach religion. The charge was repeated January 5, 1839, that a very serious effort was about to be made "to introduce religion into the common schools of Massachusetts." The writer declared that the public mind was being prepared for the scheme by the Secretary, the Board, and various speakers, among whom were Governor Everett and Rev. Mr. Charles Brooks, and continued:

> This scheme of introducing religion into the common schools, seems to be principally advocated by that class of christians who call themselves Unitarians. The Governor is a Unitarian; the Secretary of the Board of Education is a Unitarian; a majority of the Board are Unitarians; those clergymen who have taken the most active part in advocating this scheme are Unitarians. In one word, it seems to be a Unitarian scheme. It is proposed to establish County Institutions for the education of teachers, who are to be *prepared* to carry out this system of *religious* instruction. But can it be supposed, that the Orthodox, the Baptists, the Catholics, the Universalists, will consent that their children shall learn religion of schoolmasters? Are all schoolmasters to be of a particular faith? We suppose so. They must all be of approved faith, or they can have no employment. We are exceedingly suspicious

of this scheme; and we shall not fail to express our opinions from time to time. Let the public be vigilant, and watch the signs of the times, for we know not whereunto these things will grow.

The *Trumpet's* blasts are now suddenly pitched to another key. A new enemy has appeared in the field. Fear of supposed Unitarian designs to teach sectarian religion is forgotten, and the Board of Education and its Secretary are discovered as the champions of righteousness and the law in the face of the Orthodox attack led by the author of the *Four Letters*. We are informed that "Almost all the christian sects in the State seem moved in regard to the common schools,"[17] and that the Board's proposal to introduce moral and religious instruction into the schools had immediately created three distinct parties: those who approved the Board's course; those who feared the Board would not go far enough; and those who, believing that the general principles of morality were already being adequately taught, feared that to go farther would result in the introduction of sectarian dogmas. The writer says that the Law of 1827, was passed because some overzealous teachers had attempted to proselytize the school children, and that in numerous instances prior to its enactment "tracts of the rankest sectarian publications were introduced into the schools." The law had proved salutary in its operation, and had been preserved when the Statutes were revised. In spite of the Secretary's statement in the *First Report* that he believed no one would want the law repealed, the *Trumpet* declares there is now evidence that there are some who wish to introduce sectarianism into the schools.

For the first time in a public defence of the Board that we have found, whether printed or spoken, Packard is named as the author of the offensive pamphlet. The *Trumpet* says:

The pamphlet is anonymous, of course, we know not with certainty its author. Report attributes it to an Agent of the American Sabbath

[17] *Trumpet and Universalist Magazine*, February 23, 1839.

[*sic*][18] School Union (by the name of Packard, we believe,) who made an attempt to introduce the publications of the Union into the Schools of Massachusetts. On meeting with a decided repulse from the Board of Education, on the ground of the *highly sectarian* character of the books he recommended, he has vented his indignation in these four letters to Dr. Humphries [*sic*].[19]

After reviewing some of the proposals in the *Four Letters,* the article continues:

Were we not accustomed to see so much rashness and impudence in some of the sectarian leaders in this country, we should certainly conclude that the author of the Letters to President Humphries [*sic*] was insane.

A mild attempt to avoid the appearance of a too sudden change of editorial attitude toward the Board is made in closing. The writer observes that although the present Board is opposed to the introduction of sectarian religion into the schools, nevertheless, if the time should come when a majority of the Board were to favor it, then serious consequences would follow!

Before considering the *Trumpet's* final article, which was published a week later, we must pause to comment on one statement in the editorial we have just reviewed. The writer says that the Board's advocacy of moral and religious instruction immediately created three parties. It is apparent from the evidence we have cited, that there was an element of truth in the *Trumpet's* statement. But it also appears that in 1838 the second and third groups were relatively small. Certainly the *Trumpet's* opposition was almost, if not altogther, unique, while the Orthodox group had uttered scarcely a word of opposition prior to Packard's attack at New Bedford, more than a year after the Board had begun its work.

[18] The American Sunday School Union. This was a common mistake. See p. 55, note 1.

[19] The name of Dr. Heman Humphrey was frequently misspelled in the newspapers and pamphlets of the day.

If the *Trumpet* was not sure of the authorship of the *Four Letters* when the issue of February 23 went to press, it is clear that the editor took pains during the following week to make certain that the author was Frederick A. Packard of Philadelphia. For in the issue of March 2, 1839, he is mentioned by name eight times. In a long, scathing article, Packard's efforts to secure the Board's approval for his library, and his challenge of the Law of 1827 and of the authority of the legislature and the Board, made in the March letters in various newspapers, are laid bare. We quote the closing paragraph:

> A few more remarks, and we have done. Let those who say "*there is no danger,* they can never carry their schemes into effect," be on their guard. We should not be surprised, if an effort were made in the Legislature to repeal the law against the admission of sectarian books. Let the community be on their guard. Watchfulness cannot injure us. We see there is a very strong desire, most impudently avowed, to introduce these books by a vote of the district, even against the wishes of the law, the Legislature, or the Board of Education. The spirit that could suggest this would stop at nothing. Again,—we say, be on your guard.

Thus did the friends of Horace Mann and of the Board of Education rally to their defense,—Orthodox Congregationalists and Baptists as well as Universalists and Unitarians, all friends of the cause of education in Massachusetts. Thus was the cause strengthened to meet the test when the fire of sectarian jealousy and fear, kindled by selfishness and fanned by misdirected zeal, should threaten to sweep away the new structure.

On January 20, 1839, the day after he wrote the letter to Dr. Storrs, Horace Mann made the following entry in his Journal:

> Some efforts making by disappointed orthodoxy to disaffect the public with the Board. They want, at least some of them, their doctrines introduced. This cannot be, either theirs, or those of any others, considered as sects merely. The fundamental principles of Christianity may & should be inculcated. This should be done thro' the medium of a proper text-book to prevent abuses. After this, each denomination

must be left to its own resources, for inculcating its own faith or creed.

Packard's appeal to the conservatism, the loyalty, and the prejudices of the Orthodox people of Massachusetts "to put down this new-fangled philosophy of education" was not wasted. The seeds planted were to grow and bear fruit in the form of three tests in the legislature before the cause of education could be assured a reasonable degree of security. But before going on to witness these battles in the General Court, we shall give our attention to the founding of the normal schools, that other subject of contention, which became, with the Library, the center about which the fight was waged.

CHAPTER VII

The Founding of the Normal Schools

THE need for teachers' training schools had been recognized long before the Law of 1837, creating the Board of Education, was passed. The normal school idea in Europe was at least a century and a half old, while in America the work of training teachers had been declared to be one of the purposes of founding Franklin's Academy in Philadelphia in 1756. Due chiefly to the efforts of Governor De Witt Clinton of New York, that State had in 1827 granted aid to academies for the education of teachers. In 1823, Rev. Samuel R. Hall established at Concord, Vermont, what is believed to be the first school in America founded specifically to train teachers.[1]

Large credit for the establishment of the Massachusetts normal schools is due to James G. Carter, whose successful labors to secure the passage of the Law of April 20, 1837, we have previously noted. In 1827 he had memorialized the Legislature, urging the establishment of a seminary for training teachers, and a bill providing for an appropriation for such a school was lost in the Senate by one vote. In the same year Carter established in Lancaster, his home town, a private school for teachers, but was obliged because of financial difficulties to abandon the project after a few months.[2] Mr. Carter continued his efforts and lost no opportunity to call the attention of the public to the need for trained teachers, and when in 1838 a

[1] See also J. P. Gordy: *Rise and Growth of the Normal School Idea in the United States*, in U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 8, 1891, and E. P. Cubberley: *Public Education in the United States*, pp. 285 ff.

For an interesting account of the work of Rev. Charles Brooks, see "Charles Brooks and his Work for Normal Schools" by John Albree in *Medford Historical Register*, January, 1907.

[2] Barnard: *American Educational Biography*, p. 190.

handsome gift was offered to the State for this cause, it was his privilege, as chairman of the committee on education in the Senate, to put through the bill authorizing the establishment of the normal schools.

Mr. Mann records in his Journal that on March 9, 1838, a number of gentlemen met at the home of Mr. Edmund Dwight and discussed the expediency of applying to the Legislature for a grant to establish "Teacher's Seminaries," and that after most of the party had dispersed, Mr. Dwight had given him authority to state to the Legislature that he would guarantee to give ten thousand dollars for this purpose, provided the Legislature would grant an equal amount. The entry concludes:

On Monday, it is my intention to make a descent upon the two honorable bodies, and see if they cannot be rubbed so as to emit the requisite spark. This looks well.

The document addressed to the General Court is included in a Journal entry on March 13:

I had the satisfaction of sending the following communication to the Legislature. "To the President of the Senate & the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Gentlemen. Private munificence has placed at my disposal the sum of $10,000 to promote the cause of Popular Education in Massachusetts.

The condition is, that the Commonwealth will contribute the same amount from unappropriated funds in aid of the same cause; both sums to be drawn upon equally as needed, and to be disbursed, under the direction of the Board of Education, in qualifying teachers for our common schools.

As the proposal contemplates that the State in its collective capacity shall do no more than is here proffered to be done from private means, and as, with a high and enlightened disregard of all local, party, & sectional views, it comprehends the whole of the rising generation in its philanthropic plan, I cannot refrain from earnestly soliciting for it the favorable regards of the Legislature. Very respectfully, Horace Mann, Secretary of the Board of Education."

This appears to be glorious! I think I feel pretty sublime! Let the stars look out for my head!

Mann's communication was referred to a joint committee of the House and Senate, who reported a bill providing for the grant of ten thousand dollars as proposed. The responsibility for expending the money "in qualifying teachers for the Common Schools in Massachusetts" was given to the Board of Education. This bill was passed almost unanimously by both Houses and became a law April 19, 1838.[3]

The task of organizing the new institutions was to prove a most difficult one. There were no state normal schools in America to which the Board might look for precedents. Three major problems presented themselves, the wrong solution of any one of which would be likely to result in severe, if not fatal, criticism: the number and locations of the schools; the selection of suitable teachers; and the choice of the curriculum.

The question as to the number of schools to be established, and their location, had to be determined first of all. It was decided that greater effectiveness could be secured by placing three or four schools in various parts of the state, than by using the funds for only one school. But as the amount available was far from being adequate to cover the entire expense of such a plan, it was decided to place the schools in communities where the cost of buildings, equipment, and other expenses, exclusive of teachers' salaries, would be borne by friends of the cause of education in those communities. Accordingly the Board gave notice to this effect in all parts of the state, and invited the towns to make application for the schools. The Board in their *Second Annual Report* name thirteen applications that were made within the year from the following communities: Plymouth County, Wrentham, Byfield, Barre, Southbridge, Lancaster, Topsfield, Concord, Lexington, Worthington, New Salem, Northfield, and Braintree. We learn from the *Common School Journal* that seven of these communities applying were willing

[3] The vote in the House was unanimous, and there was only one opposing voice in the Senate.—*Life and Works of Horace Mann,* II, 101.

to furnish the building, equipment, etc., required by the Board, although only four of the seven are named in this article: Lexington, Barre, Lancaster, and New Salem.

It will be remembered that Dr. Storrs of Braintree, in his reply to Mr. Mann, criticized the Board because the normal schools were located "in the most thoroughly Unitarian towns in the Commonwealth." This letter was written February 20, 1838, when only two locations had been decided upon—Lexington and Barre. Neither the minutes of the Board's meetings nor the article in the *Common School Journal* gives the reasons that led the Board to select Barre rather than Lancaster or New Salem. It may be readily believed that its geographical location was the chief factor, inasmuch as it is situated between Lancaster and New Salem, and lies near the center of the State. It is true that the Unitarian church in Barre was slightly stronger at this time than the evangelical Congregational church which had been organized in 1827, when some of the members of the older society had withdrawn because of doctrinal disagreement. The Methodists had organized a church several years later, and there were also a Baptist church on the eastern boundary of the town near the village of Coldbrook and a Universalist society at Barre Plains. Each of the two last mentioned churches was about three miles from the center.[4] As compared with Lancaster, it would appear that Barre would have been the less objectionable of the two, and that Dr. Storrs would have found still greater ground for complaint had the school been located in Lancaster. For while the Congregational church in that town had become Liberal, it was not until February 20, 1839, the very day that Dr. Storrs wrote to Mr. Mann, that a religious society, out of which later grew the evangelical Congregational church, was organized.[5]

[4] *A Memorial of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Incorporation of the Town of Barre, June 17, 1874*, p. 125.

[5] Abijah P. Marvin: *History of the Town of Lancaster, Massachusetts*, pp. 574 ff.

The reasons for selecting Lexington as the location for a school in the northeastern section of the State were its favorable situation and the fact that it offered the most liberal donation. The Congregational church in Lexington was Unitarian in doctrine, and the "Calvinistic Congregationalists" had no organization at this time.[6] The Baptists, however, had built their house of worship in 1833, and at the time of Dr. Storrs' writing were under the able leadership of Rev. O. H. Dodge.

In Dr. Storrs' own town of Braintree, which had also tried to secure one of the normal schools, the Congregational church,[7] of which he was pastor, had kept the Orthodox faith, though the First church in the "North Precinct," now Quincy, had been one of the leading churches in the Unitarian movement. It is not unlikely that disappointment in not securing one of the normal schools had sharpened the criticism of the Braintree pastor.

A dispute arose over the location of the third school in the southeastern part of the State, which delayed its opening and caused the Board a great amount of trouble. A fund of ten thousand dollars had been raised in Plymouth County to provide suitable premises for a school, but the contest for the school between Plymouth and Bridgewater became so keen that the question of its location had to be left to disinterested persons not resident in that county. Bridgewater was finally chosen.[8]

The truth is that the work of deciding the locations of the normal schools was far from easy, and considering the factors involved and the nature of the towns selected, Storrs' criticism seems unwarranted. While laboring with the task Mann wrote

[6] Charles Hudson: *A History of the Town of Lexington, Middlesex County, Massachusetts,* p. 363.

[7] This church had been founded in 1707, when the line dividing the town into the North and South precincts was determined upon. See also W. S. Pattee: *A History of Old Braintree and Quincy,* pp. 220-223, 284 ff.

[8] *Third Report,* p. 11.

in his Journal, "If we get Teachers' Seminaries, it will not be because they are of spontaneous growth."

The second problem presented was that of securing suitable teachers for the normal schools. If the Board of Education, or the Secretary, cherished any secret design to banish religion and the Bible from the schools, or to exploit them for the advantage of any particular sect, the facts ought to be revealed by the type of men selected to train the future teachers of the schools.

One of the first men to whom the position of principal was offered was Rev. Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet of Hartford, the pioneer founder of the American Asylum for the Deaf, and leader in the education of the deaf and the feeble-minded. Mr. Gallaudet was Orthodox in faith, and the two Orthodox members of the Board of Education, Dr. Emerson Davis and Dr. Thomas Robbins, were authorized to secure his services.[9] Mr. Gallaudet did not wish to leave his important work and declined the Board's invitation.[10]

The minutes of the Board record that on March 14, 1839, Rev. Jacob Abbott of Roxbury was unanimously appointed principal of the normal school at Lexington, and the committee of visitors, Sparks, Rantoul, Putnam, and Mann, were authorized to make a contract with him to serve for a salary of fifteen hundred dollars. Mr. Abbott was a brother of Rev. John S. C. Abbott, the author of *The Child at Home*, the book used by Packard to test Mann's opinion. Dr. Robbins records in his diary[11] that he called on Mr. Abbott on March 20 and expresses fear that he will not accept the appointment. Abbott's letter in reply to Mann's is an interesting document:

Roxbury March 21, 1839. To Messrs Jared Sparks, Robert Rantoul Jr. George Putnam, & Horace Mann: Visitors of the Normal School at

[9] See Robbins' letter, pp. 51, 52.

[10] An interesting account of his remarkable life and work is given in Barnard's *American Educational Biography*, pp. 98 ff.

[11] *Diary of Thomas Robbins*, II, 526.

Lexington. Gentlemen. I have made the proposition which you communicated to me on the 13th instant, from the Board of Education of this State, that I should take charge of the Normal School about to be established at Lexington, the subject of much inquiry and reflection since that time. The question is affected by a great variety of considerations, which are of course too numerous, & of too complicated a nature for me to detail them here. On balancing them however, in my own mind, I find the preponderance, on the whole, steadily against my undertaking the trust.

I appreciate highly the honor done me by the appointment, and I see nothing to object to in the details of the plan, as arranged by the Board, so far as they have been communicated to me. I ought perhaps to make one exception to this remark, in reference to the place selected for the school. I allude to the fact, that the denomination with which I am myself connected, and to which probably a very important portion of the pupils would belong, has, at Lexington, as I am informed, no place of public worship. I have supposed that this circumstance might become, in the present highly sensitive state of the public mind, on the subject of religious differences, a source of some embarrassment to me, in the position I should occupy. I do not readily see what course I could pursue, in respect to public worship on the Sabbath, in such a case, which would not soon create a good deal of friction. I should wish if I were to embark in an enterprise of this kind, attended, necessarily, with many uncertainties & hazards, to avoid every source of embarrassment and difficulty which is not essentially involved in the very undertaking itself.

With this single exception, as I remarked above, I have nothing to object to in respect to the details of the plan. The geographical position of the place selected, the general outline of arrangements in respect to instruction and discipline, the basis on which the experiment rests, and the pecuniary terms proposed, would all have been perfectly satisfactory to me. My decision rests therefore, mainly upon general views of the nature of such an enterprise as this, considered in relation to my present situation, & my plans and purposes of life.

With sentiments of great personal respect for the members of the Committee and of the Board, I am very sincerely yours Jacob Abbott.[12]

[12] Mr. Abbott, first principal of the Mount Vernon School for Girls (1829-1833), was author of the "Rollo Books." He was the father of Dr. Lyman Abbott. In 1834 he organized an evangelical Congregational church in Rox-

The Board promptly met Mr. Abbott's objection by offering him the principalship of the normal school at Barre, where there was an Orthodox Congregational church. He finally decided not to accept, and the Board's minutes briefly state that he declined the principalship of either normal school.[13]

Three other men, all of whom were well-known educators and all of whom were of the evangelical faith, declined the Board's invitation to places of leadership in the normal schools. Dr. Alonzo Potter of Union College, Schenectady, New York, a leader in the Protestant Episcopal church, who in 1845 became the "statesmanlike" Bishop of Pennsylvania,[14] was urged to devote his large ability to the new cause. In his earlier years he had been rector of St. Paul's Church in Boston. In a cordial letter, dated March 30, 1839, he declined the position, stating that he preferred not to leave his present work.

Professor Ebenezer S. Snell[15] of Amherst College was another teacher whom the Board, without success, sought to secure for one of the principalships. His final decision is reported in a letter dated April 22, 1839, and written by Osmyn Baker to Horace Mann. Professor Snell expressed a hearty sympathy with the Board's project, but did not wish to leave the work in which he was engaged at Amherst.

Dr. George Washington Keely, professor of Mathematics and

bury. The church was named the "Eliot Church" in honor of the "Apostle to the Indians" and founder of the First Church in Roxbury, which had become Unitarian. For a sketch of his life, see the memorial edition of *Abbott's Young Christian*, New York, 1882.

[13] "Minutes," April 12, 1839.

[14] Charles C. Tiffany: *A History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America*, pp. 489-491.

[15] Ebenezer Strong Snell was Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy in Amherst College. He was son of Rev. Thomas Snell, who was pastor of the Orthodox Congregational church at North Brookfield from 1798 to 1862, and who as secretary of the General Association of Massachusetts presided at the meeting held in New Bedford where Frederick A. Packard publicly attacked Mr. Mann and the Board of Education. See also J. H. Temple: *History of North Brookfield, Massachusetts*, pp. 277-281, 734.

Natural Philosophy in Waterville College,[16] a Baptist institution in Waterville, Maine, was the fifth Orthodox teacher to be offered the principalship. His letter, dated May 1, 1839, in which he declined the Board's offer, is among the "Mann Papers."

The first man to accept the Board's appointment was Rev. Cyrus Peirce,[17] who by this decision became the first principal of the Lexington Normal School, the first state normal school in the United States. Mr. Peirce had been a Unitarian minister at North Reading, Massachusetts, from 1818 to 1826, but for several years prior to this pastorate he had taught a private school at Nantucket, to which town he returned in 1831, to become the head of an excellent private school. In 1837, at considerable personal sacrifice, he had become principal of the newly organized Nantucket High School, and it was here that Horace Mann found him, an authority on teaching methods and a wise and able teacher.[18] To Mann's letter urging him to accept the principalship at Lexington, he replied that there ought to be many teachers in the state whose qualifications were superior to his own and, with a humilty that was characteristic of the man, added: "Is it really true that in old, enlightened Massachusetts, you can find nothing better?" Fully conscious of the seriousness of the experiment, and the difficulties involved, he accepted the appointment, saying: "I had rather die than fail in the undertaking."

Mr. Mann's joy at securing this exceptional teacher after many months of fruitless search is thus recorded in his Journal:

> June 13 . . . Went to Nantucket, saw Mr. Peirce, obtained the consent of the school committee for his discharge from his engagements to them, and returned yesterday worn down with fatigue. But,

[16] Now Colby College.

[17] Incorrectly spelled "Pierce" in the *Life*. Many letters written by Mr. Peirce are preserved in the "Mann Papers"; in these the spelling is uniformly "Peirce."

[18] Barnard: *American Educational Biography*, pp. 405 ff. See also *Proceedings of Lexington Historical Society*, I, 95 ff.

at last, I believe we have a most competent principal for one of our Normal Schools; and this is a subject for unbounded rejoicing.

The Board had decided to admit only young women to the Lexington school, while the school at Barre was to be coeducational. The experiment at Lexington was to be a critical one and would be watched with the keenest interest by all. Horace Mann realized that there must be no failure in the plans, and when a promised gift to fit up a boarding house for the school was unexpectedly withdrawn, he sold his law library to meet the emergency.[19]

The date appointed for the opening was July 3, 1839. On the night before, Mr. Mann wrote in the Journal:

> Tomorrow we go to Lexington to launch the first Normal school on this side the Atlantic. I cannot indulge at this late hour of the night, and in my present state of fatigue, in an expression of the train of thought which the contemplation of this event awakens in my mind. Much must come of it, either of good or of ill. I am sanguine in my faith that it will be the former. But the good will not come itself. That is the reward of effort, of toil, of wisdom. These, as far as possible, let me furnish. Neither time nor care, nor such thought as I am able to originate, shall be wanting to make this an era in the welfare and prosperity of our schools; and if it is so, it will then be an era in the welfare of mankind.

The opening the following day was most disheartening. We quote again from the Journal:

> The day opened with one of the most copious rains we have had this rainy season. Only three persons presented themselves for examination for the Normal School in Lexington. In point of numbers, this is not a promising commencement. How much of it is to be set down to the weather, how much to the fact that the opening of the school has been delayed so long, I cannot tell. What remains but more exertion, more and more, until it *must* succeed.

"Father Peirce," as his pupils affectionately called him, spared

[19] *Life*, p. 235, note.

himself no labors to insure success. He seldom allowed himself more than four or five hours' sleep out of twenty-four. He carefully prepared every lesson he taught. He maintained a large correspondence. He established a model school and supervised the normal pupils' teaching. He examined and criticized each article for the *Normal Experiment,* the paper issued monthly by the students. He even performed the janitor service for the school, and in the coldest weather would go at midnight to replenish the fire, and rising again at three or four in the morning would shovel snow and perform other duties in order that the room might be comfortably warm and all in readiness at the opening of school in the morning.

The empty seats in the schoolroom were disheartening, and Mr. Peirce's letters written to Mann during the first months show that he believed the Board had made a serious mistake in selecting him for principal. But he said: "I have put my hand to the plough, the furrow must be driven through, and the whole field turned over, before I will relinquish my effort." Slowly the empty seats began to be filled, until by the end of the first term of three months a fair sized class was enrolled. The following year opened with a large class, and prospects for success were bright. In later years, Mr. Mann often said that "Father Peirce" saved the cause of the normal schools. The first normal school principal was a Unitarian, secured only after vain efforts had been made to enlist the services of five Orthodox teachers.

The Board's search for an Orthodox principal for Barre was more successful. After prolonged negotiations, Rev. Samuel P. Newman, a professor in Bowdoin College, Maine, was released to assume the duties of the principalship of the second normal school. A letter which Professor Newman wrote to Mr. Mann a month before the Barre school was opened shows that at that time the people of Worcester County were waiting with watchful eyes to see what would be the policy of the school in relation to the teaching of religion. Some feared it would be used for

the benefit of the Unitarians, while others believed it would become an agency for the spread of Orthodox doctrines. The presence of Professor Newman was doubtless the reason for the latter opinion; for late in that year, when an assistant had been requested, we find Charles Hudson, a member of the Board, in a letter dated November 26, 1839, recommending to Mann that the Board should select a man with Liberal views in order to allay the suspicion that the Barre school was being used for the purpose of Orthodox propaganda!

The Barre Normal School was opened September 5, 1839, under conditions much more encouraging than those attendant upon the Lexington opening two months earlier. Governor Everett was present and delivered an address.[20] Twelve young women and eight young men were admitted, and with the expectation that ten more would be enrolled within a few months, success seemed assured from the beginning. Professor Newman was so successful in the new venture that when Nicholas Tillinghast was called the following year to become principal of the Bridgewater Normal School, he spent six months with Professor Newman at Barre, studying his methods of teaching, before beginning his duties at Bridgewater.

The Bridgewater Normal School was opened September 9, 1840. The principal, Colonel Nicholas Tillinghast, who was a graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point, had seen five years of active service in the west and south and

[20] In the Journal Mr. Mann recorded: "This afternoon the Governor has delivered a very acceptable address. . . ." In publishing this item, the author of the *Life of Horace Mann* has incorrectly inserted in parenthesis the word "Briggs" after Governor. Edward Everett was governor of Massachusetts in 1839. Hon. George N. Briggs had but recently retired to private life after having spent twelve years in Congress as representative from the eleventh district, Berkshire and Hampshire counties. He had been appointed a member of the Board of Education in 1839. He was elected governor in 1843, taking up the duties of office in 1844, and served in this station for seven consecutive years. See William C. Richards: *A Memoir of George N. Briggs,* Boston, 1867.

had taught natural science and ethics at West Point. Mr. Tillinghast was a Unitarian, and for many years served as deacon in the Unitarian church at Bridgewater.[21] The school at Bridgewater is the only one of the first three founded which was never moved.

The difficulty met by the Board in determining the locations of the normal schools seems to have been equaled by that of securing suitable teachers for them. In a letter to Mr. George Combe written shortly after the two schools were opened, Mr. Mann says:

> The opening of the two Normal schools, and the finding of two suitable and acceptable individuals to take charge of them, cost me an incredible amount of anxiety. I believe I counted over all the men in New England by tale before I could find any who would take the schools without a fair prospect of ruining them. But I trust we have succeeded. At any rate, my nightmare begins to go off. I will not trouble you by stating the difficulties of the problem given to me for solution; which was to do right, and not offend the ultra-orthodox. I needed your philosophy, i.e. equanimity, for that task.[22]

The third critical question which called for a decision had to do with courses of study and regulations. It will be remembered that the Board of Education had no authority to prescribe textbooks or courses of study for the public schools, and that the mere suggestion that they recommend textbooks had brought a protest from twenty towns. But in the normal schools the Board were given full responsibility, and they came out squarely in

[21] See also Henry Barnard: *American Educational Biography,* pp. 441 ff.; and Rev. John H. Lockwood, D.D.: *Westfield and Its Historic Influences, 1669-1919,* II, 363 ff.

[22] *Life,* p. 118. In 1838 Mann became acquainted with George Combe, the Scotch phrenologist, then on a lecture tour in the United States. Subsequently, the two carried on a correspondence for many years. The principles of phrenology set forth in Combe's book *The Constitution of Man,* seemed to give a firm basis for belief in the "accelerating improvability of the race" and were adopted by a considerable group of Americans including Mann, Charles Sumner, and S. G. Howe. See also E. L. Pierce: *Memoir and Letters of Charles Sumner,* II, 294; B. A. Hinsdale: *Horace Mann, etc.,* pp. 99, 100.

favor of non-sectarian religious instruction. The eleventh item in the list of the subjects of instruction reads: "The principles of Piety and Morality, common to all sects of Christians." It was also directed that "A portion of the Scriptures shall be read daily, in every Normal School."[23] The Board believed that in this subject they were going as far as the law and their own authority would permit.

The supervision of the normal schools was placed in charge of committees of visitors, appointed by the Board from its own membership. Mr. Mann was also a member of each of these committees. Dr. Storrs, in his letter to Mr. Mann, had criticized the preponderance of Unitarians on the Board of Education. The letter was dated February 20, 1839. There was but one committee of visitors at that time,—those appointed for the Lexington school. These men were President Sparks, Robert Rantoul, Jr., Rev. George Putnam, and Mr. Mann, all Unitarians. This fact did not necessarily indicate "design," however, but might readily be explained on the ground that they were residents of the eastern part of the state. That this is the true explanation is seen when we learn from the minutes of the meeting held a few weeks later, that Hudson, a Universalist, Davis, an Orthodox Congre-

[23] The course of study was as follows:

1. Orthography, Reading, Grammar, Composition and Rhetoric, Logic.
2. Writing, Drawing.
3. Arithmetic, mental and written, Algebra, Geometry, Book-keeping, Navigation, Surveying.
4. Geography, ancient and modern, with Chronology, Statistics and General History.
5. Physiology.
6. Mental Philosophy.
7. Music.
8. Constitution and History of Massachusetts and of the United States.
9. Natural Philosophy and Astronomy.
10. Natural History.
11. The principles of Piety and Morality, common to all sects of Christians.
12. THE SCIENCE AND ART OF TEACHING, WITH REFERENCE TO ALL THE ABOVE NAMED STUDIES.

A portion of the Scriptures shall be read daily, in every Normal School—*Common School Journal*, I, 38.

gationalist, and Briggs, a Baptist, "with the Secretary whenever he should be desired," were appointed visitors to the normal school at Barre. The three first named men lived in the central and western parts of the state. When Bridgewater, in the southeastern part of the State, was selected for the location of the third school, Dr. Robbins, the Trinitarian Congregationalist, living south of Bridgewater in Rochester, and John W. James, an Episcopalian and Democrat, of Boston, were, with the Secretary, chosen visitors.

Reviewing the ground we have covered in our examination of the steps taken by the Board in founding the normal schools, we see first of all that in deciding the question of locations the determining factors were geographical position and the financial aid pledged by the local friends of the cause of education. Although in the two locations which had been decided upon at the time of Dr. Storrs' criticism—Barre and Lexington—the Unitarian church was strong, yet at Barre there was an Orthodox Congregational church, and at Lexington an Orthodox Baptist church. The location of the school at Bridgewater had to be decided finally by an impartial committee living outside of Plymouth county. In the second place, we find that the Board made five attempts to secure an Orthodox man as principal before Mr. Peirce, a Unitarian, was chosen for Lexington; and that after Professor Newman, an Orthodox teacher, had been placed at the head of the Barre school, a Liberal assistant was needed to assure all parties that the school would not be exploited for sectarian purposes. The third fact that our examination shows is the Board's positive decision to include in the normal courses of study the principles of morality and the elements of religion common to all sects, and to have the Bible read daily in these schools. Finally, the visitors appointed to supervise the various normal schools were selected on the basis of their convenient proximity to the respective schools, and not because of their religious affiliations.

Such criticisms as those offered by Dr. Storrs were unjust, but they would be given a ready hearing by many who had neither the opportunity nor the disposition to examine the facts and learn, as Rev. O. H. Dodge of Lexington had learned, that the criticisms were not well founded. Religion is conservative; it deals with the highest and most sacred interests of the race, and seeks to conserve what is deemed to be of value. When, therefore, a man of determination such as was possessed by Frederick A. Packard, seeing the "incendiary, with torch in hand, approaching the garner in which are deposited the cherished blessings and hopes of many generations,"—not to mention the hopes regarding his own Library—when such a man with such motives gave the alarm, it would be surprising if there would not be found others who would respond to his call to take political action to "put down this new-fangled philosophy of education." To the battle which was to be waged in the Legislature we now turn our attention.

CHAPTER VIII

The Fight Is Carried to the Legislature

DURING the summer of 1839, signs were not wanting that a storm was approaching. Horace Mann, always alert, was conscious of danger. In a letter to his friend, Dr. Samuel G. Howe, dated July 21, 1839, he wrote:

I am obliged for your kind expressions at the close. All the letters, which I have lately abound with something of that *genus* of good will. I apprehend, it is either because my correspondents know or have some presentiment, that peril impends. Indeed, I am well informed—but this is for *our circle only,* that one man has declared war & levied troops against the Board & myself. It is Brownson, that Proteus of doctrine. He will attack them, because they are Whigs & me for the same reason, besides my being in favor, as he has heard, of Kneeland's prosecution.[1] Now when I learnt this, I ran my eye over his mailed coat & visor, & saw distinctly, that there is an opening to his eye & another to his heart. But why should I spend my strength, in combating assailants, when it is all ten-times-over-needed for the cause. His general notions on the subject of Education are, that the world is not yet ready for action, & will not be, until he has settled the eternal principles upon which the work is to proceed. A grand article might be written, sustaining views diametrically opposite.

Brownson was a peculiar character, radical, unstable, erratic.[2] Mann's characterization of his theory of education was

[1] In 1834, Abner Kneeland, who had been successively an Orthodox minister, a Universalist, and an agnostic, and who at that time was editor of the *Investigator,* was indicted for blasphemy on account of having published three "blasphemous and indecent" articles in his paper on December 20, 1833. He was finally sentenced, in 1838, to two months' imprisonment. A petition for his pardon, headed by William Ellery Channing, although rejected by the Governor, had a large influence in favor of freedom of speech. It is likely that Mann favored the prosecution because of the indecent character of one of the articles. See also William Henry Channing: *Memoir of William Ellery Channing,* III, 101, and the *Boston Quarterly Review,* October, 1838, p. 514.

[2] Orestes Augustus Brownson, editor of the *Boston Quarterly Review,* was

justified by Brownson's article on the *Second Report* of the Board of Education. It appeared in the October number of his magazine, the *Boston Quarterly Review*.[3] The article is filled with criticisms of the Board and their plans. Brownson thinks religion and politics should be taught in the schools; but the Board's proposal to teach the elements of Christianity common to all sects does not meet with his approval—for this means nothing at all to him. He offers no constructive suggestion, however. He fears that the Board of Education, which is composed of Whigs, with the exception of "a single Democrat to save appearances,"[4] is to become an agency for spreading the "Whig philosophy." The system being built up by the Board of Education, with its normal schools and its library, threatens to control education in Massachusetts as effectively as does the Prussian system in Prussia. This system will prevent the spread of progressive views, and he asks with becoming modesty, "What theological seminary would have selected Jesus, Paul, or John, in their lifetime, for a professor of theology? Nay, what Board of Education on earth, would make the editor of the *Boston Quarterly Review* a professor in a Normal School?" He believes the establishment of the Board was a mistake. All matters pertaining to education, except that of finances, should be left to the districts. Responsibility should not even be divided with the towns. After all, the schools are not of great importance; their influences are weak when compared with the general influences of society, and the influences which Nature and Providence are

successively a Presbyterian, a Universalist, an agnostic, a Unitarian, and, in 1844, set his mind at rest by accepting the authority of the Roman Catholic church and becoming a member of that body. Subsequently he was a staunch champion of Catholicism. At the time of this letter, his religious wanderings had brought him into the slough of agnosticism, where as the founder and leader of the "Society for Christian Union and Progress," an organization for workingmen in Boston, he was preaching a radical sort of religion of Humanity and gaining some distinction as a radical leader in the Democratic party. For a history of his religious experience, see his book, *The Convert: or, Leaves from My Experience.*

[3] II (1839), 393. [4] Hon. Robert Rantoul, Jr.

constantly bringing to bear upon us: "Shut up your schoolhouses, and in all essential matters your children would grow up about the same, they would were they open. This is a consideration which it is not wise to overlook."

It does not appear that great importance was attached to Brownson's opposition. Mr. Edmund Dwight, in a letter to Mann, dated August 9, 1839, wrote: "I have no fears from Mr. Brownson." It is nevertheless true that Brownson wielded political influence in the Democratic party, and his contention that the Board was a Whig instrument for propagating the "Whig philosophy" in the public schools would find credence in many minds which would count in the test of strength in the approaching election.

The Democratic party in Massachusetts at this time was a party of protest against the rule of the Whigs. Its ranks were recruited largely from the humbler members of society, the farmers and other rural elements, small merchants and bankers, the working classes in the cities, the seafaring folk, and the Irish immigrant group. In general these groups, with the exception of the Irish, were in the Trinitarian churches: Orthodox Congregational, Baptist, Methodist, and Quaker, rather than in the Unitarian church. Many families of the Trinitarian denominations sent their children to Brown University rather than to Unitarian Harvard. Arthur B. Darling[5] has checked the names of Democratic leaders of the time with lists of students at Brown, and believes that the fact that many of these sons of Orthodox families became leaders in the Democratic party points to a close sympathy between Orthodoxy and Democratic political principles.

The Whigs, on the other hand, were the conservatives, the wealthy classes, financiers, manufacturers, merchants, and shipowners. Many shopkeepers and native laborers were also of this group. The Unitarians were usually Whigs. These alignments

[5] A. B. Darling: *Political Changes in Massachusetts 1824-1848*, Chap. I.

can be indicated only as general tendencies, however. The Democrats were not nearly all Trinitarians. Indeed, as we shall presently see, Rev. Allen W. Dodge, one of the most persistent leaders in the political fight to destroy the Board of Education, was a Trinitarian and a Whig, while one of the staunch defenders of the cause, Hon. Robert Rantoul, Jr., was a Unitarian and a Democrat.

The Democratic State Convention for 1839 was held in Boston on October 2. Marcus Morton of Taunton, who had been the party's candidate for Governor since 1828, was again nominated. The chairman of the committee on resolutions was Orestes A. Brownson, editor of the *Boston Quarterly Review*. These resolutions, which for the most part protested against "special class legislation" and Whig policies and measures, were silent on the subject of education. The *Address of the Massachusetts Democratic State Convention to their Fellow Citizens*, which was printed with the *Proceedings* and sent broadcast throughout the State, was likewise silent, with the exception of a reference to the school fund to which the "Militia claim" and the sale of public lands in Maine had been pledged.[6] Whatever attitude Mr. Morton and other leaders in his party may have held toward the Board of Education and their plans, it is clear that education was not made an avowed issue.

Dr. Darling found that the issue which was the deciding fac-

[6] The Militia Claim was the claim of Massachusetts against the Federal Government for money expended in protecting the state from invasion during the War of 1812. In 1831, $281,000 was received in part payment. The settlement of the balance was delayed for several years. The *Address* charged that the money derived from the Militia Claim, which the Democrats said had been pledged to the school fund by the Law of 1837 (the date is incorrect; the law was passed in 1834) had been withdrawn from the school fund by the last legislature and swallowed up in state expenses. This charge was incorrect and misleading. See also *Documents in Relation to the Massachusetts Claim, House Document* 1838, No. 54; *Laws of Mass.*, March 31, 1834, Chap. 169; Charles J. Bullock: *Historical Sketch of the Finances and Financial Policy of Massachusetts, From 1780 to 1905*, p. 37; *Twenty-second Report of the Massachusetts Board of Education, 1859*, pp. 38-53.

tor in the campaign was the notorious "Fifteen-gallon Law."[7] This measure, which prohibited the sale of liquor in quantities of less than fifteen gallons, had been supported by enthusiastic men in both parties, and had become a law upon being signed by Governor Everett, April 19, 1838. The law was undemocratic, clearly a piece of "special class legislation," which took from the poor man his daily drink, while the rich were unaffected by it. The law furnished much political capital, and Marcus Morton, who had once been a president of a temperance society, was elected to repeal it. When the returns were all in, it was found that the Democratic candidate had been elected by a majority of one vote.

Meanwhile Horace Mann, probably unaware of the tempest that was soon to burst upon himself and the Board, toiled beyond his strength in the "cause." Mrs. Mann says that he was made to feel keenly the difference in the social station held by the President of the Senate and a lawyer with a lucrative practice, and that of the Secretary of the Board of Education with a small salary.[8] The following entry in the Journal, written doubtless in an hour of physical exhaustion, is an expression of the dauntless faith that gave him strength to go on:

> Laboring at my Abstract and Report with unabated vigor. How the granite mass gives way under the perpetual droppings of industry! Oh for the continuance of a good degree of health! and then exertion in this glorious cause will be a pastime. Neglected, lightly esteemed among men, cast out, as it were, from the regards of society, I seem to myself to know, that the time will come when Education will be reverenced as the highest of earthly employments. That time I am never to see, except with the eye of faith; but I am to do something that others may see it, and realize it sooner than they otherwise would. Their enjoyment may be greater than mine; but if my duty hastens that enjoyment, then that duty is greater than theirs. And shall I shrink when called to the post of the higher duty?

Encouragement and reassurance from friends were not want-

[7] Darling, *op. cit.*, pp. 239 ff. [8] *Life*, p. 121.

ing, however. The following letter from Rev. Jacob Abbott, the Orthodox Congregational minister, shows his continued and cordial interest in Mr. Mann and the Board, in spite of the fact that a few months before he had declined their invitation to become a principal of one of the normal schools. It also reveals a sense of security from the effects of Packard's attacks which impending events proved was wholly unwarranted:

Roxbury Dec. 7, 1839. Mr. Mann Dear Sir, The reports, accompanied by your note, were duly received. I wished for them to forward to Mr. Gorham D. Abbott[9] who takes much interest in your plans. He is, I believe, particularly interested in the attacks you have recently experienced, having had to encounter similar hostility himself, and from the same source.

I was at first very sorry to perceive such a disposition to be suspicious and jealous of the movements of the Board, though, on the whole, I do not know that the affair is much to be regretted, after all. I cannot perceive that much unfavorable impression is made,—on the other hand so far as I can judge from the conversation I hear, the feeling is that the Board have been condemned hastily and without cause. Considering the position which the orthodox portion of the Community occupy in reference to public education in this Commonwealth, it is to be expected that they will be a little sensitive,—but I see no reason to fear that anything will result from this discussion, except the awakening of increased interest in the operations of the Board, and this effect will be a highly salutary one.

I had it in contemplation at one time to write an article or two for the Recorder on the subject, but on reflection, and enquiry, concluded that it was unnecessary. Anything like a controversy on the subject, is carefully to be avoided.

I need not assure you of my cordial wishes for your success in your labors, and of my desire to coöperate with you whenever it may be in my power. Very sincerely yours Jacob Abbott.

[9] Rev. Gorham D. Abbott was a brother of Jacob Abbott. At the time this letter was written he was pastor of a Presbyterian church in New Rochelle, N. Y. The "hostility" which he had encountered, was probably due to the fact that Mr. Abbott was an agent of Harper & Brothers, of New York, for whose library Rev. Mr. Holmes of New Bedford had sought the approval of the Massachusetts Board of Education in 1838. See p. 53, note.

In December, Mr. Mann received an offer of the presidency of a college in Missouri, with a salary double that paid by the legislature of Massachusetts for his services, and with a "splendid house, gardens, etc." included. After consulting with friends he declined the invitation. He wrote in his Journal:

. . . as far as my own preferences are concerned, I would rather remain here, and work for mere bread, than go there for the wealth of the great Valley of the Mississippi. Oh, may I prosper in this! I ask no other reward for all my labors. This is my only object of ambition; and, if this is lost, what tie will bind me to earth?

Such a spirit was needed for the crisis which was to be met with the coming of the new year and the new Governor. It was reaffirmed, accompanied by a note of apprehension, in the first Journal entry of the New Year:

Jan. 5, 1840, Sunday . . . I enter upon another year not without some gloom and apprehension, for *political madmen* are raising voice and arm against the Board; but I enter it with a determination, that, I trust, will prove a match for *secondary* causes. If the First Cause has doomed our overthrow, I give it up; but, if any thing short of that, I hold on.

But although the enemy was now beginning to declare his purpose, our statement that the question of education and the Board was not made an avowed issue in the campaign is supported by the fact that prior to the inaugural address even Mann did not know what position Governor Morton would take. The following note in the Journal is dated January 19, 1840:

This week has been made memorable by the fact that Marcus Morton has been in the constitutional manner declared Governor of the Commonwealth & has taken the oath of office. This makes him *ex officio* Chairman of the Board of Education & brings me into direct official relations with him. Whether the official relation will be followed by any personal one, & if so what that personal relation will be, is [a] matter of uncertainty. It is yet uncertain what stand he will take relative to the cause of Education. If he is wise he will espouse it heartily.

If he is just, if he have any humanity in his Statesmanship, he will do the same. Whether he will do it, is at least doubtful. I hope this is, *in fact*, unjust. It is not so in intention.

A week later Mr. Mann wrote:

Jan. 26. This week, on Wednesday, Governor Morton gave his inaugural address. He cut the Board of Education entirely. *Probably he did not know of its existence.* He has got to know it. He has made a mistake on his own personal account, I believe. But time will make further developments.

But notwithstanding the fact that Morton had not mentioned the Board of Education by name, and had entirely overlooked their achievements, he had not "cut them entirely." Referring to the subject of education he had said:

The Education of the people, is a subject which has commanded so much of the public consideration, and been so often and so ably presented to successive legislatures, that it will not fail to command your earliest attention and most anxious deliberations. Its importance in a democratic government, which must be sustained by the intelligence and virtue of the people, cannot be too highly appreciated. The system of free schools which has been transmitted from generation to generation, has improved in its progress, and is now in a high degree of perfection. But it is capable of still further improvement. Recently, great labor has been bestowed upon and great advancement made in some departments of education. But the very improvements in the higher branches, and in the more elevated seminaries, excite the ambition and engross the attention of those most active in the cause of education, and thus expose the common schools to fall into neglect and disrepute. To arouse that strong and universal interest in them, which is so necessary to their utility and success, an interest that should pervade both parents and children, the responsibility of their management should rest upon the inhabitants of the towns. And the more immediately they are brought under the control of those for whose benefit they are established, and at whose expense they are supported, the more deep, and active will be the feelings engendered in their favor, and the more certain and universal will be their beneficial agency. In the town and district meetings, those little pure democracies, where our citizens first learn the rudiments and the practical operation of free institutions,

may safely and rightfully be placed the direction and the government of these invaluable seminaries.[10]

Morton's speech could mean nothing else than an assumption that the control and management of the common schools had been taken out of the hands of the town and district committees by the Board of Education, and that this control should be returned without delay. The recommendation strongly reminds us of Brownson's article, published three months before in the *Boston Quarterly Review,* though it will be remembered that Brownson would give all authority to the districts and none to the towns. Such an assumption on the part of the Governor was plainly unjust, although, as we have seen, ground for fear of encroachments had been given by the Board's suggestion in their *First Report* that they might find it necessary to prescribe textbooks for the schools, and make compliance with their recommendations a condition of receiving the benefit of the school fund.

Mann stopped the February issue of the *Common School Journal,* just as it was going to press, to insert that part of the Governor's speech which dealt with the subject of education. It was accompanied by an editorial note in which Mann interpreted the Governor's words to mean that no change was to be expected, but that the new chairman of the Board of Education had "fully endorsed" the course pursued by the Board in behalf of the common schools. The "coincidence of views" between the former governor and the present was a source of the more pleasure, because it had been feared by some friends of the cause, "that with a change of men, there was to be a change of measures, on this vitally important subject."[11] It does not seem possible that Mann could have failed to see the threatened danger in the Governor's words. The only explanation, therefore, to account for this in-

[10] *Address of His Excellency Marcus Morton, to the Two Branches of the Legislature, on the Organization of the Government, for the Political Year Commencing Jan. 1, 1840. House Document* No. 9, pp. 29, 30.

[11] *Common School Journal,* II, 47.

terpretation of the speech seems to be that, since there had not been a positive statement directed against the Board, Mann hoped to win his coöperation, or maneuver him into a position where he would not openly attack.

The Governor's gesture was readily obeyed by the legislature, however, and on March 3, 1840, the House directed the Committee on Education "to consider the expediency of abolishing the Board of Education and the Normal Schools, and to report by bill or otherwise." Four days later, March 7, a majority of the committee reported a bill to abolish the Board of Education and the normal schools, and to return to Mr. Edmund Dwight the ten thousand dollars given by him for these schools.[12] The report was signed by Rev. Allen W. Dodge, an Orthodox clergyman, who was the Whig representative from Hamilton. The other members of the committee, who favored the action, were Rev. Chester Tilden of Belchertown, Frederick Emerson of Boston, and B. D. Hyde of Southbridge.

The report which accompanied the bill is an interesting document. The committee argued, in the first place, that the Board had a strong tendency to gain the entire control of the common schools, "and practically to convert the Legislature into a mere instrument for carrying its plans into execution." If this were not true, then the Board was useless; for the legislature could gain suggestions from other sources, for any enactments needed:

> If, then, the Board has any actual power, it is a dangerous power, trenching directly upon the rights and duties of the Legislature; if it has no power, why continue its existence, at an annual expense to the Commonwealth?

If the Board's duties were limited to the collection and diffusion of information, the committee believed that the voluntary associations of teachers would serve for this purpose more satisfac-

[12] The reports of the majority and of the minority of the Committee on Education are in the *Common School Journal*, II, 225 ff.

torily than the Board was able to do, and they expressed the belief, furthermore, that no discoveries of importance to education would fail to become generally known through the medium of these associations.

The committee stated that they had reported the bill, in the second place, because the centralizing tendency of the Board was erecting a system similar to those of Prussia and France, one that would destroy local supervision and place "a monopoly of power in a few hands, contrary, in every respect, to the true spirit of our democratical institutions; and which, unless speedily checked, may lead to unlooked-for and dangerous results." As evidence of this danger, the committee cited the proposal to teach morals in the schools, and argued that since "morality is considered a part of religion, and is, to some extent, modified by sectarian views," the danger must be "obvious."

The Library which the Board had sanctioned was condemned, first, because it was being recommended by this central Board, and secondly, because the Board was endeavoring to make it non-sectarian:

> Since, however, religion and politics, in this free country, are so intimately connected with every other subject, the accomplishment of that object is utterly impossible, nor would it be desirable, if possible.

The determination of the writers of this report to have their own religious doctrines taught in the schools, or to drive out the fundamentals common to all sects, is apparent. They urged that the omission from books on morality and religion of doctrines which they believed to be true, would lead to erroneous impressions.

> A book, upon politics, morals, or religion, containing no party or sectarian views, will be apt to contain no distinct views of any kind, and will be likely to leave the mind in a state of doubt and skepticism, much more to be deplored than any party or sectarian bias.

The report next touched upon the normal schools, also "imi-

tated from France and Prussia." These schools were not needed. Academies and high schools, which cost the Commonwealth nothing, were perfectly competent to train all the teachers needed for the schools. A special course of instruction for teachers was unnecessary,—a mechanic who had learned his trade was able to teach it to another without the aid of a normal school to teach him the art of instruction. In fact, considering the briefness of the time the schools were kept open each year, it was obviously impossible, and perhaps not desirable, that school teaching should become a distinct profession!

Four days later, March 11, a minority report signed by John A. Shaw and Thomas A. Greene was submitted. Horace Mann's Journal entries show that he was busily engaged at this time, in helping to prepare the defense. In the "Mann Papers" there is a long letter written by him to Mr. Shaw setting forth arguments for the continuance of the Board and the normal schools. The substance of these arguments was incorporated into the minority report. In contrast with the sectarian bias which characterized the report of the majority, it was a dignified, reasoned statement.

The report defends the Board, pointing out that it is made up of men highly esteemed by the community. They differ from one another in politics and in religion, and "when acting together, as a Board, they are a mutual watch and check upon each other's sectarian or party preferences,"—a sure defense against the "dangerous tendencies" of which the majority report complains. There will be time enough to suspect conspiracy when the Board have interests in common. "In such a body as the Board, there is more danger that action will be paralyzed, than that it will encroach upon the rights or welfare of the public." The members of the Board have given, on the average, a third of a year in the discharge of their duties, imposed by the legislature, in the development of the normal schools, for which service they receive no compensation except their actual expenses. The Secre-

tary's salary is not sufficient to pay his traveling expenses, and the other expenses connected with his office. What motive can anyone have for occupying these positions, except that of doing good? Moreover, the suggestion that the Board can control the legislature to the extent asserted by the majority report, reflects little credit upon the intelligence and independence of the legislature!

The majority's argument that if the Board has power, it is dangerous, and if it does not, it is useless, reminds the minority of the Saracen caliph's decision, "when he had in hand a similar work of destruction," to burn the books of the Alexandrian Library. That the Board can give advice without encroaching upon the rights of their fellow citizens, is proven by the results of the *Report on Schoolhouses*.[13]

In reply to the assertion that the Board's function of collecting and diffusing information can be left to voluntary associations of teachers, the minority remind the legislature that, prior to the Board's establishment, there were only three such organizations in the State, two of which immediately sought the cooperation of the Board when it was created, and that since that time county associations have been formed in every county, except one, and more than fifty county conventions have been held.

The minority call attention to Mr. Mann's last two Reports—the second and third—in which he has shown that the Prussian system is arbitrary, while that of Massachusetts is voluntary, to the advantage of the latter. The minority say, however, that they do not wish to give the impression that they would make the mistake of rejecting any improvement merely because it was of

[13] *The Supplementary Report on Schoolhouses* was prepared by Mr. Mann and published early in 1838. In it he exposed the evils of the poorly constructed buildings in which many of the schools were kept. Plans and suggestions for building suitable schoolhouses were furnished with the report. The effect was surprising. The minority report says that hundreds of schoolhouses were rebuilt or remodeled in the State. The report was widely circulated in this country and republished in England.

foreign origin. Moreover, there have always been state laws to regulate the Massachusetts schools; those laws threaten with despotism just as truly as the Board threatens with centralization and monopoly of power. The Board has no power except that of giving advice. It decided not to recommend schoolbooks, even though requested to do so by the school committees representing more than seven-eighths of the population of the State.

Paley's *Natural Theology* is cited in answer to the majority's statements regarding the desirability of partisan or sectarian books on politics, religion, and morals, and the report continues:

> This is well known to be one of the soundest treatises ever written, and yet it has been well said of it, that no one could tell whether its author were orthodox or heterodox, churchman or dissenter.

Again, the minority ask, what is to become of the school law of 1827, which enjoins the teaching of piety, but forbids the use of sectarian textbooks?

The subject of the normal schools is treated in some detail. The steps by which the Board has entered into contracts with teachers and others are reviewed, and a strong plea is made that the Legislature shall not violate these contracts and break faith with Mr. Dwight, with the teachers and pupils in the normal schools, with the boarding-house keepers, and the friends in the towns where the schools are located, who have pledged their support. The closing paragraphs urge that the normal schools, so recently begun, be given a fair trial. If they and the Board are abolished now, they cannot be said to have failed, but to have "fallen, prematurely, by the hand that should have sustained them."

In the debate on the bill, which was held March 18, 1840, Dodge upheld its provisions while Shaw[14] defended the minority

[14] A brief report of Dodge's speech, taken from the *Boston Daily Advertiser*, and the full text of Shaw's rebuttal, may be found in the *Common School Journal*, II, 239 ff.

report. Mr. Shaw stated that the minority were greatly surprised when they heard the decision of the majority, that the committee had not given more than two hours to a consideration of the subject, and that he had not had the least anticipation of the committee's decision one-half hour before it was made. To Dodge's denial of this statement, Shaw replied that "whatever may have been said or done by individuals of the committee, out of doors," not more than two hours had been spent on the order for abolishing the Board and the normal schools.

While the debate was in progress, Mr. Mann was obliged to leave the city to keep an appointment in New York. His own state of mind is recorded in the Journal. This picture of a public man, waiting a whole day in New York for important news from Boston, belongs to a century that is gone:

Was obliged to leave Boston, yesterday in the midst of the debate on the Report of the Education Committee for abolishing the Board & the Normal Schools. Of course, though the question is, ere this, undoubtedly decided; yet I remain in ignorance, and must do so until to-morrow morning, when, on arrival of the mails, I shall probably learn their fate. Tomorrow, then, is a day of *mark*. Let it come. If the Board is abolished, it will show how much there is to do, in this great cause; & I think it will only inspire me with new zeal to accomplish it. If, on the other hand, it triumphs, then its claim to public favor must be evidenced by the good it shall accomplish. In either case, I stand almost pledged:—if right, to advance the right; if wrong, to repair the wrong.

The defeat of the measure was decisive; two hundred and forty-five votes were cast against it, and one hundred and eighty-two in its favor. The following is Mann's comment in his Journal, on receiving the news in New York:

March 21. Saturday. Yesterday heard the news from Boston, that the bigots & Vandals had been signally defeated in their wicked attempts to destroy the Board of Education.—182 in favor, 245 against it. I have not as yet been able to bring my mind into a state to describe the merits of this case. Perhaps I may do it sometime,—perhaps it is not

worth the doing. But the letters of congratulation over their defeat show how much others enjoy it.
March 22. Another Huzza today from Boston, on account of the Emerson defeat.

A letter which Mann wrote to Dr. Samuel G. Howe at this time is interesting as a portrayal of the state of mind of one who had so completely devoted his life and all his powers to the cause in which he believed he was doing God's will, that he could trust to final victory, no matter what dangers might threaten:

New York, Mar. 21, 1840. My dear Howe, I have a handful of letters from Boston, all filled with shouts & exclamation points. Yours just received is amongst the most welcome,—& this I will not say to any of the rest, tho' they all make me glad, because they come in like a *feu de joie,* & are sincere & hearty.

And now, since the matter is all over, I must tell you, that from the moment, when I was first made acquainted with the decision of the committee, until I heard the result, my own feelings have been a psychological wonder to me. Before the decision I was not able to participate in the liveliness of the apprehensions; nor since the decision, have I been quite able to follow their exultings. I am almost ashamed to say, that it has seemed to me like some foreign matter, in which I had only a general interest. I have eaten better, slept better, digested better & worked easier than for a long time before. I am in doubt, whether this is stupidity, or whether it is partly owing to views, which I have for a long time accustomed myself to take of the great subject. It has become a fixed habit of mind with me to look at this educational movement as a part of the Providence of God, by which the race is to be redeemed. Feeling & conviction alike declare it to be a portion of the Divine ordinances. This is one of the first articles in my religious creed. I find it easy, in any moment of despondency to throw myself forward into the coming centuries, & look back & see that the work has prospered & prevailed. I can look at it as more than a prophecy,—as a fact, & a *passed fact*. Forms may be revolutionized, abolished, but the movement is lasting as eternity. You & I & others may have to work on against obstruction & embarrassment, but I see in the future the beautiful & glorious development, I shall leave in other hands. Is not this a source, not merely of satisfaction in our toils, but ought we not to feel a pride in being accounted worthy of this more honorable

post of labor. Let us, then, go on and buffet these waves of opposition, with a stout arm & a confiding,—& that shall be a conquering—heart.

"Forsan et haec olim meminisse juvabit."

Said the old poet, & I want to change but one word—"Forsan" for "Certes" [*sic*]. I feel such a scorn for the wretches that I cannot feel mad,—such a pity for them, that it seems almost wicked to hope they will ever be any better, they must despise themselves so if they are. But I will work another year with more heart than ever; & the encouragements of yourself and others, shall be music in my toils.

Mr. & Mrs. C.[15] arrived here yesterday. I am going on with them—to Philadelphia next Wednesday—then in a day or two to Harrisburgh, Pittsburgh, &c. Do, do come,—then we will discourse upon all high matters, & at odd jobs & between the courses of our meals, settle the fate of nations, & set up stakes for Time to steer by. Yours ever & most truly Horace Mann.

Tell Mills[16] to abandon his bank book & ledger & to fly from the East wind. His health is worth more than all long & short staples. Why should he consider a cotton-bag as the principal & himself as the accident? He ought to live and be as old as Methuselah, instead of being dogged out of the world by rheumatism, pthisis [*sic*] & podagra the hell-hounds. P.S. Love to Mr. and Mrs. Mills.

That one hundred and eighty-two members of the House voted to abolish the Board and the normal schools is a serious commentary on the state of the public mind in Massachusetts in its attitude toward education. If the fight had been led by Democrats, it could have been explained as a party move to destroy what was alleged to be a Whig organization, which Brownson feared would be used to spread the "Whig philosophy." But our problem is not so simple. For although Morton opposed the Board, we find that both Allen W. Dodge and Frederick Emerson, two of the four members of the Committee on Education who prepared the majority report, and led the fight

[15] Mr. and Mrs. George Combe of Scotland.

[16] Mr. Charles H. Mills was a merchant of Boston, a member of the firm, James K. Mills & Co. He served as treasurer for the Board of Education. Edmund Dwight was also a member of the firm.

in the House, were Whigs and signed an *Answer* to Morton's inaugural address, which the Whigs published and distributed as political propaganda.[17] Among other things, the *Answer* called attention to the Board of Education, which had been recently established, and expressed surprise that the Governor, in his assertion that the common schools have fallen into "neglect and disrepute," seemed to have quite overlooked the labors of the Board.

Fortunately, records have been preserved which furnish clues to the motives of three of the four members of the Committee on Education who prepared the majority report. Rev. Allen W. Dodge, of Hamilton, was an Orthodox minister. A. D. Mayo, in an article in the *Report of the United States Commissioner of Education for 1896-97*,[18] describes him as "an eccentric, enthusiastic, and magnetic popular leader." His antagonism to the Board and the normal schools was due to religious prejudice. The defeat of his measure only fired him with renewed zeal to carry on the fight, as is seen in the following extract from a letter written to Mann by "Father Peirce," the principal of the Lexington Normal School. It is dated September 18, 1840, six months after the fight in the legislature:

> Dodge of Hamilton, was in town a few days since. I did not see him, but I understood he said, he meant to pursue this Board of Education; —Next winter, in the Legislature, they would hear from him. He told Esq. Phinney, that the reason why he wished to demolish them, is that he regarded them as a REAL ENGINE OF UNITARIANISM!! Weak, silly man!

Another letter written the following winter when Dodge was making a second attack, contains an excellent analysis of his character and motives. It was written by an Orthodox clergy-

[17] *Answer of the Whig Members of the Legislature of Massachusetts, constituting a majority of both branches to the Address of His Excellency Marcus Morton, delivered in the Convention of the two Houses, Jan. 22, 1840.*

[18] I, 715 ff. In this article his name is incorrectly given as "Alvin A. Dodge."

man and friend, Rev. S. P. Parker, minister of the Episcopal church in Stockbridge, Mass. The date is March 17, 1841:

Dodge of Hamilton is an old college companion of mine, and we have been much together. He was once a successful lawyer in the City of N. York. He lost his wife & child at one blow; became serious; quitted a lucrative business, and went to Andover to study. The next thing I heard of him, was his attack on the Board a year since. He is really a *clever* fellow. Anglice et Yankee; but with a spice of obstinacy, which is always aggravated when a man has embarked in a *theory*, which I fancy is his case. I judge his prejudices to be inexpugnable. Last winter he got a little tincture of Loco focoism, which aided by his fears for orthodoxy, accounts in my mind for his course.

Rev. Chester Tilden was pastor of the Baptist church in Belchertown.[19] The following is an extract from a letter written to Mann by Myron Lawrence, who had succeeded the Secretary as President of the Senate. It breathes the political animosity of the day:

Belchertown June 26' 1840 Hon. H. Mann. Dear Sir . . . It is true that one of our representatives voted to abolish the Board of Education. He is nobody—an anti-temperance, ignorant, loco foco Baptist prist [*sic*] He has very little influence here, none except among the very lowest of our population. He was elected by the combined efforts of rum, militia, & loco-focoism—His political days are numbered.

So far as I know the opinions of intelligent & influential men in this region, it is decidedly in favor of the Board. Our other representative voted to continue it, and our intelligent people were indignant at the parson. . . . Resp'y Myron Lawrence.

The motives of Frederick Emerson of Boston were of a different order. They were personal, and would not be worth relating but for our necessity of understanding the reasons for the attacks on the Board and Horace Mann. Emerson was a Whig. When the Board was first created, he had hoped to be included as one of its members, and had expressed his desire to a member of the

[19] *Minutes of Massachusetts Baptist State Convention, 1838-1842.*

Governor's Council. Failure to receive an appointment aroused in him a strong hostility to all that the Board attempted.[20] Not long after this overture, Emerson sent a copy of his arithmetic to Mann with a request that he recommend it for use in the schools. He singled out some problems which he had inserted as temperance propaganda; for, knowing Mann's strong temperance convictions, he hoped to secure approval for his book on this ground. Mann refused the request, and thus added to Emerson's antagonism.[21]

Opposition to the Board and Horace Mann, in the legislature and elsewhere, was due to many causes. In some instances it was personal, as was the case with Frederick Emerson. Mann was constantly being asked by authors and publishers to recommend their books. In an entry in his Journal, dated September 6, 1839, he tells of finding at his office "thirteen books soliciting a notice." Hostility was sometimes aroused among teachers. As new and improved methods were adopted, and trained teachers began to enter the field, those who were inefficient found difficulty in securing positions, and were thus added to the ranks of the opposition. Moreover, personal antagonism was often a corollary to the conservatism and inertia that resented innovations in teaching, as was strikingly seen, when, a few years later, thirty-one schoolmasters of the Boston schools attacked Mann in a body.

Another cause of opposition was due to local jealousy. The charge in the majority report that the Board tended to encroach upon the rights of the local committees was similar to the com-

[20] My authority is a letter to Horace Mann from the publishers, Marsh, Capen, Lyon and Webb, dated October 6, 1841. It is published in the *Common School Journal,* III, 330.

[21] The correspondence on which this statement is based is in the "Mann Papers." It was only after a request had been repeatedly made, which almost amounted to a demand, that Mr. Mann reluctantly yielded the facts. Loring Norcross, a member of the Common Council of the city of Boston, asked for the information when a debate was in progress in the Council on the subject of superintendent of grammar schools.

plaint which had been expressed against the legislature, thirteen years before, when the Committee on Education reported the Law of 1827. It was difficult to enforce the school laws in the towns. In the *Second Report* it is stated that in 1838 twenty-nine towns were violating the law prescribing the number of months the schools should be kept each year.[22] We have elsewhere noted that twenty towns rejected the Board's proposal to recommend schoolbooks. After the publication of Packard's *Four Letters* and Brownson's attack[23] in the *Boston Quarterly Review* had been followed by the fight in the legislature, the Board and Mr. Mann renewed their efforts to allay local jealousy by inserting in the third and fourth Reports explanations of the Board's duties and functions which showed the authority of the local committees, and the ways in which the Board coöperated with them.[24]

After making due allowance for personal antagonisms, local jealousies, and attempts to make political capital out of the various sources of opposition, it is nevertheless clear that the principal cause of hostility to the Board of Education in Massachusetts was religious prejudice. We have seen that this prejudice did not begin to express itself in any marked degree until Frederick A. Packard started his unsuccessful campaign to force the "Select Library" of the American Sunday School Union into

[22] *Second Report,* p. 33.

[23] Brownson's radical political and religious views soon eliminated him as a dangerous enemy of the Board. In the July number of his magazine, the *Boston Quarterly Review,* 1840, he published an article, "The Laboring Classes," in which he laid violent hands on most of the institutions of society. He would put down all ministers of religion, both Protestant and Catholic, and all schoolmasters. No property should be inherited, but at death all should go to the State. The Whigs seized upon the article and published it broadcast over the country as representative of Democratic policies. The Democratic party dropped him immediately. Brownson records in his autobiography, *The Convert,* that after this he became more conservative in politics and religion. He joined the Catholic church in 1844. A copy of his article reprinted by the Whigs is in the Yale University Library, U. S. Historical Pamphlets, vol. 6.

[24] *Third Report,* p. 37; *Fourth Report,* pp. 14 ff.

the Massachusetts schools, in violation of the Law of 1827. The attempt to "put down this new-fangled philosophy of education" by political action, urged in Packard's *Four Letters*, and repeated by him and others who sympathized with him, had failed. But as has already been intimated in the letters regarding Dodge, the fight was not to be given up after the first encounter.

CHAPTER IX

The Fight Is Continued

GOVERNOR MORTON, as Chairman *ex officio,* of the Board of Education, did not "espouse" the cause in the hearty manner for which Mann had hoped. If, early in January, the Secretary was uncertain what stand the Governor would take, and even if it should be conceded that the inaugural address was believed to commit him to the Board's course, subsequent encounters proved that little coöperation could be expected from him. The defeat of the enemies of the Board in the Legislature had been followed by a lull in the storm broken only by an ineffectual outburst by Brownson. In the April issue of the *Boston Quarterly Review*[1] he had published two articles in which the Board of Education and the School Library were held up to ridicule. Both articles were so weak as fully to justify Mann's observation in his Journal, that they were "absurd and egotistical."

Morton soon assumed an attitude toward that old subject of contention, the School Library, which threatened further trouble. At the annual meeting of the Board, held May 27 and 28, 1840, the Governor refused to give his sanction to any book in the Library. Mann's Journal tells the story:

May 30, Saturday. This week the Board of Education has had its annual meeting. The new *ex officio,* Gov. Morton & his appointee, Mr. James,[2] were present.

[1] III, 225 ff., 406 ff.

[2] John Warren James, a leading Democrat of Boston. He was a member of the Protestant Episcopal church, and although "a pure scion of Bunker Hill stock" he was one of the organizers and the first president of the Boston Association of the Friends of Ireland, which was founded in November, 1840, in order to aid Ireland in her struggle for a domestic parliament. See also James Spear Loring: *The Hundred Boston Orators,* pp. 460-469.

The Governor has broken in upon the whole plan of the School Library. He stated that it had been a subject which had given him great anxiety & perplexity. If it were a new question, he should not have much doubt about it. He had not been satisfied with the course of the Board, in relation to the Library. The act creating them was very general. It made it their duty to attend to education in all its parts. He did not know but it would authorize them to take measures for the military education of the people. The form of approval adopted by the Board seemed to carry us back a century or two. It approximates to a license. If it were a new question, he should be opposed. It looks like the old black letter licenses. He could not sanction, without compromising his own rights. He did not wish to injure those who had embarked in it, was willing it should continue if it could be done without the names. Was very much in favor of libraries.

The second day Mr. Hudson called him out, by saying that it seemed useless to discuss questions about altering the form of the sanction of the Board, until it was known how far the objections of any member went, whether to the present form only, or to the whole plan.

On this, the Governor said he doubted both the right & the propriety of the Board's giving any recommendation to books, & he read a part of a letter which he had prepared to send to the Publishers, wh. was as follows, "I must decline to give my official sanction to any book, which has been or may be presented to the Board."

After this, a modification became indispensable. Thus has the most excellent plan of the Board in relation to this most important subject, been defeated,—& as I believe, from the lowest *partisan* motives. Such a man is unworthy of any office.[3]

The Board were equal to the occasion. The Governor had effectively blocked the road to unanimous approval; but the minutes of the meeting held on May 28 record the action taken after he had defined his position:

Upon a motion of Mr. Bates, it was voted, That the rule of the Board of Education, requiring that each member of the Board shall give his sanction to every work, which shall be published for the Common

[3] Dr. Robbins' opinion of the Governor is expressed with characteristic brevity in his diary:

"May 27, 1840. Met with the Board of Education. We had two sessions, and did but little. Our new chairman is a poor one." *Diary of Thomas Robbins,* II, 570.

School Library, be so far dispensed with as that when any one of said Board entertains doubts of the rights of the Board to sanction the publication of books, or is interested, in any such work, either as author, or in a pecuniary manner, then the work may be published without his sanction: and that a Committee be appointed to attest the approbation of such books as may be approved by a majority of the Board as a part of the series of school libraries now publishing by Marsh, Capen, Lyon & Webb;—and that the books of the series may be published by said firm either with the signatures of those members of the Board, who are not so excepted, or by the attestation of the committee, at their option. And Messrs Robbins, Sparks, Hudson, Rantoul and Briggs were appointed on said committee.

The committee appointed to pass upon books for the library was chosen with a view to safeguarding against partisanship and sectarianism. Robbins was a Trinitarian Congregationalist, and a Whig; Sparks was a Unitarian, and a Whig; Hudson was a Universalist, and a Whig; Rantoul was a Unitarian, and a Democrat; Briggs was a Baptist, and a Whig.

After the encounter with Governor Morton, little difficulty was experienced by the Board and Mr. Mann during the remainder of the year. In his Journal and in letters to friends, Mann complained that politics were absorbing the attention of the public to the exclusion of everything else, including the cause of education.[4] After the November elections, Mann wrote to Mr. Combe that the new legislature was entirely different from the last. Frederick Emerson, whom Mann looked upon as the author of the movement against the Board, had been "dropped by common consent, as the reward of his malevolence."[5]

[4] The year 1840 was notable by virtue of the fact that the Whig's candidate for the Presidency, General William H. Harrison, defeated Van Buren and thus broke the long reign of the Democratic party. President Harrison's untimely death soon put Tyler in the President's chair. Horace Mann, while traveling in the new country west of the Alleghanies in April, 1840, had visited the modest home of General Harrison at North Bend. An interesting account of this visit, and of Mann's impressions recorded in his Journal, is published in the *Life*, pp. 126 ff.

[5] *Life*, p. 140. Emerson's name, which appears in the copy of the letter in the "Mann Papers," is omitted from the copy in the *Life*.

Governor Morton, who had been elected to repeal the "fifteen-gallon law," was defeated in November by the Whig candidate, John Davis of Worcester; but the sky was not completely cleared of clouds. Governor Davis' inaugural address was a disappointment to Mann. For although it was not hostile, neither was there a cordial recognition of the Board. Mann considered it "non-committal,—unworthy of the man,—unworthy of the State."

But if there was now nothing to fear from the Governor, there was one man who, amid the excitement of the presidential election of 1840, had not been too busy to plot for the Board's destruction and who now renewed the fight in the House of Representatives. That man was Rev. Allen W. Dodge of Hamilton whose activity Cyrus Peirce had reported to Mann in his letter of September 18, 1840.

The attack came in the form of a minority report of the Committee on Education, which proposed a bill to transfer the work of the Board of Education to the Governor and Council, and the duties of the Secretary of the Board to the Secretary of State. The strong emphasis which the Democrats had placed on the need for economy, and the year of Democratic administration just experienced, doubtless had much to do with the stress on curtailment of expenses which was made by the Legislature in 1841. Seizing upon this situation, the enemies of the Board and Mr. Mann argued that this piece of machinery was unnecessary. We have seen that Dodge's opposition was due to religious bias. Mann's view of the movement is revealed in the Journal:

Feb. 21. A minority of the Committee on Education, in the House, have reported a bill to transfer the powers and duties of the Board of Education to the Governor and Council; and of the Secretary, to the Secretary of State. Thus another blow is aimed at our existence, and by men who would prefer that good should not be done, rather than that it should be done by men whose views on religious subjects differ from their own. The validity of their claim to Christianity is in the

inverse ratio to the claim itself; they claim the whole, but possess nothing.

This statement is supplemented by the following extract from Mann's letter to George Combe. It is dated February 28, 1841:

It is remarkable, that, at the very time that I am receiving your congratulations on the prosperity and security of my plans to improve our popular education, my friends in the General Court are preparing to fight another battle for their existence. Dodge, who was among the foremost in the attack last year, has returned to the assault again with as much virulence as ever. It so happens that retrenchment of expenses is the popular hobby this year; and both parties are running a race for the laurel of economy, and are willing to sacrifice all the laurels of the State to win it. The question will come on for discussion tomorrow or next day. We all think it cannot be carried through the Senate, if, unfortunately, it should pass the House. But are not reformers always persecuted?[6]

When the measure was debated in the House, the same men who had defended the majority and minority reports in the debate of 1840, Dodge of Hamilton and Shaw of Bridgewater, again faced each other. The conditions under which the vote was taken, and the defeat of the bill, are reported in another letter from Mann to Combe, written April 1, 1841:

In my last I stated that another attack was made upon the Board of Education in our House of Representatives. Its decision was postponed till very near the close of the session; and it came up in the afternoon, and before a very thin house, almost half the members being absent. Mr. Shaw made a few remarks in defence: when the bigot Dodge followed in a speech of an hour's length, the whole intellectual part of which was made up of misrepresentations; and the whole emotive part, of aspersion. The previous question was then moved and sustained; many of the Whigs voting for it, in order to shorten the session (which has been the Whig hobby this year): and, without one word being said in reply, the proposition was voted down, —131 to 114. Never was any question taken under circumstances more

[6] *Life*, p. 149. Corrected from copy in the "Mann Papers."

disadvantageous to the prevailing party; and I am inclined to think that it will be considered, in flash language, *a settler*.[7]

At this juncture an anonymous article entitled "Religious Instruction in Common Schools" appeared in the *Princeton Review*.[8] The writer makes extended quotations from the *Four Letters* to Dr. Humphrey, and says that the Massachusetts system excludes all religious instruction from the schools. He continues:

> We are not surprised at this. It is well known that Unitarian influence has the seat of its power in Massachusetts. It has appropriated to its support and propagation the revenues, and charities, and renown of that most ancient and venerable institution, *Harvard University*. The educational interests of the State are in the hands of a Board, a majority of whom are of the Unitarian, or some lower school. The Secretary is a Unitarian, and a very considerable part of his salary is (or was) paid by a wealthy Unitarian gentleman of Boston, who also, if common report may be relied upon, contributed one-half of the amount invested in the two Normal schools of that state.[9] Now we confidently submit that with such an influence bearing upon the interests of education in that state, it would be very difficult for anything in the form of positive religious instruction to be introduced into the schools, except with prunings and modifications which the great body of Christian professors in that state, would regard as destructive of its scriptural character.

The writer shows concern because of the tendency in New York to exclude all religious teaching from the schools. Unless the Protestant religion is taught in the public schools, Protestantism will drift into irreligion, and the Roman Catholics will gain the predominance over our governmental institutions. The spirit of Protestantism is the spirit of liberty, and the Protestant religion must therefore be taught in the schools. By the Protestant religion, he means the views held by "nineteen-twentieths of the religious Protestants of this country." These are: "The

[7] *Life*, p. 160. Corrected from copy in the "Mann Papers."

[8] *Princeton Review*, July, 1841, XIII, 315 ff.

[9] Mr. Edmund Dwight added five hundred dollars per year to Mr. Mann's salary of fifteen hundred dollars paid by the State.

right of private interpretation—the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and their sufficiency as a rule of faith and practice—justification through the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ alone—the necessity of regeneration by the spirit of God, the resurrection of the just and the unjust and the everlasting condemnation of the wicked."

The writer urges that the Bible must be taught (not read merely) in the schools. He insists that each district must decide the character of the religious instruction to be given, and concludes with an appeal "to all Christian men of all Protestant denominations and parties, to renounce all connection with any system of public instruction which does not fully and distinctly recognize the religion of Jesus Christ, revealed in this gospel, as the ground-work of the whole scheme. . . . Unbelievers in his gospel, bigots, fanatics and ultraists of any class, may have schools on their plan." But if the public schools cannot be conducted as he suggests, he would separate from them and renounce "the trifling boon of government patronage."

Evidence has not been found to show that Packard ever openly attacked the Board or Mr. Mann after the attempt to discredit them at New Bedford, although we have seen that it was charged that nearly all of the criticism during the first year and a half, while seeming to issue from many quarters, actually originated with him. The fact that he did not again attack openly makes the article from the *Princeton Review* of peculiar interest when we learn from the Index Volume of that magazine, issued in 1871, that the author of this anonymous review of the anonymous *Four Letters* was Frederick A. Packard.

It is worth while to note just here that the American Sunday School Union met with disappointing results from its project of preparing the "Select Library" which Packard vainly attempted to introduce into the Massachusetts schools. Of the thousand sets of this library which were prepared, only fifty or sixty sets were sold for use in public schools throughout the country. The Un-

ion's report for 1841 states that they were objected to "on the score of their religious character."[10]

The effect upon the public mind of Packard's article in the *Princeton Review* was probably not very great, though it is likely that it strengthened the prejudices of many people, while adding to the annoyance which former attacks had brought to Mr. Mann. The difficulty of carrying on his work in the presence of this sectarian hostility, which he was never allowed to forget, is seen in the following passage from the Journal:

> May 24, [1841] Boston. . . . Have not quite completed my lecture, owing to the infinite difficulty of steering amid rocks so thick that in avoiding one it is almost impossible not to strike on another. People will bear truths if expressed in one way, wh they will crucify one for expressing in another; & I have to select the way, if possible, that does not lead to crucifixion,—not so much, however, I believe on my own account, as on account of the cause. I hope in this I do not deceive myself.

Meanwhile Dr. George Putnam, the Unitarian minister from Roxbury, had served out the term for which he had been appointed to the Board of Education, and retired. His place was filled by Dr. Heman Humphrey, the president of Amherst, to whom Packard had addressed the anonymous *Four Letters*. Dr. Humphrey was a man of unquestioned orthodoxy, and his appointment could not fail to inspire confidence in many whose fears had been aroused by the Packard propaganda. Fearing that Humphrey might decline the appointment, Mann wrote to William B. Calhoun, Congressman from Springfield, whose correspondence with Davis, Humphrey and Mann in 1838 we have elsewhere examined, and enlisted his coöperation in securing the Amherst president for the position. Humphrey accepted, and met with the Board for the first time at the annual meeting in May. He was immediately made a member of the executive com-

[10] See also *The Fifteenth Annual Report of the American Sunday School Union*, Philadelphia, 1839, pp. 24 ff., and the *Seventeenth Report*, 1841, pp. 13 ff.

mittee of the Board, and one of the committee of visitors to supervise the normal school at Barre.[11] In his Journal Mann expresses his hope with respect to this appointment:

May 31, 1841. . . . The Board held its meeting on Wednesday last as anticipated. The recently appointed member, Dr. Humphrey took his seat. God grant, that this may stifle the rage of the orthodox.

In spite of opposition, the year 1841 was one of progress. The attack in the legislature had failed, notwithstanding the unfavorable conditions under which the vote was taken, and there were occasional signs which indicated that the confidence of the public was being gradually restored. A letter written to Mr. Mann on May 19, from Rev. S. P. Parker, the rector of the Episcopal church at Stockbridge, relates that the editor of the Stockbridge *Weekly Visitor,* a Democrat paper, had willingly published a notice of the educational convention, soon to be held in that town. Mr. Mann was advertised as the principal speaker. Mr. Parker, whose letter concerning Dodge we have noted, considered the attitude of this paper a reason for encouragement.

Another encouraging letter was one received from Horace W. Taft, a lawyer in Sunderland, who was a member of the school committee in that town. It was a letter of introduction to Rev. Austin Carey, the Orthodox minister of the Congregational church in Sunderland, who presented it to Mr. Mann when he called upon the Secretary in Boston. The letter illustrates the extent to which prejudice had been created, as well as the patience and tact which were needed to be exercised by friends of the cause of education, in order to restore confidence:

Sunderland May 22, 1841. H. Mann Esq. Dear Sir. Since writing the enclosed I have had a short conversation with Rev. Austin Carey of this place, who will hand you this, on the subject of the School Library, and requested him to call on you if convenient. He readily consented & observed that he should like to. You are aware I presume

[11] "Minutes," May 26, 1841.

that from [some] source or other a prejudice has gotten up in the minds of some, that an insiduous [*sic*] attempt is being made thro' said Library to disseminate erroneous, or sectarian opinions in religion & morals. It is not best for us to be over credulous or over suspicious.— I think from the characters of those who have made the Selections, that no intention of the kind would be entertained for a moment—but prejudice where it exists or is in danger of being spread in a community must be regarded, and removed, or prevented if we desire to introduce an improvement having relation to the matter on which it operates—I have requested Mr. Carey if he has opportunity with you to satisfy himself on that point concerning the Library, that after his return I may refer to him, to satisfy any, who may raise the objection against subscribing on that account. I consider Mr. Carey a very honest, fair, judicious, intelligent man, disposed to judge favorably in all cases, where evidence will justify it, and I am pleased with the opportunity now afforded of escaping from a dilemma that has long troubled me—

I have delayed for months to stir about the Library lest I should fail & cause the time when it could be brought about to procure one would be long delayed—One gentleman in this place I ascertained had imbibed the prejudice somewhat strongly. And as he was a person who would be likely to have considerable influence and zeal sufficient to make the most of it, I thought it best to make no movement on the subject until I could remove, or obviate all objections, he might make —I have therefore been silent on the subject—I hope now no reason will remain much longer why active measures should not be taken for supplying our Districts with the Books—

I think the District in which I reside will be very likely to subscribe for it readily—if they should that will lead the way for the others . . . I am Sir with Respect your Friend & Servt H. W. Taft.

An echo of the contests in the legislature in 1840 and 1841 was heard in the annual meeting of the American Institute of Instruction held in Boston, August 17-20, 1841. Dr. Samuel G. Howe read an extract from the *Edinburgh Review* for July, 1841, in which the writer, in reviewing the two attacks in the legislature, had said that the hostility to the Board of Education had proceeded "apparently, from persons who are hostile to all

improvements in the public mind, and who consider their own influence in danger of being diminished in proportion as that of reason and morality is increased." Frederick Emerson, the author of the majority report of the Committee on Education in 1840, was present and immediately arose and declared that this article had been written by George Combe of Scotland, and "had been concocted in the publishing house of the Massachusetts Board of Education." Having no proof for his statement, the effect upon the assembly was one of amusement. His further remarks in defense of his stand in the legislature in 1840, and his criticism of the Board, the School Library, and the normal schools, brought effective replies from several men, including Robert Rantoul, Jr., of the Board of Education, and George B. Emerson, the president of the American Institute of Instruction.[12]

The article had been written by George Combe. A letter to him from Mann dated October 13, 1841, published in the *Life,* tells of the various opinions as to its authorship prevailing in Boston.[13] Emerson's charge that the article was "concocted" in the Board's publishing house in Boston was sifted by Mann, who on October 6, 1841, wrote a letter of inquiry to Marsh, Capen, Lyon and Webb. The allegation was absolutely denied by these publishers, and in their reply of the same date they explained the reasons for Emerson's hostility on the ground that he had been disappointed in not receiving an appointment to a place on the Board of Education. We have already alluded to this letter in our discussion of Emerson's reasons for antagonism to the Board and Mr. Mann.

Dr. Howe's defense of the Board and the normal schools, in the instance just cited, was not exceptional. The famous pioneer

[12] The report of this meeting is copied from the *Salem Gazette* into the *Common School Journal,* III, 328 ff.

[13] *Life,* p. 153 ff. The name of Frederick Emerson, which appears in the original, is omitted from the copy in the *Life,* and on p. 155 Mr. Sparks is referred to as "Mr. S."

in the work of education for the blind was one of Mann's closest friends. In the letter to Combe just cited, Mann says:

Howe is doing nobly for the cause. Indeed, I sometimes think we should have been shipwrecked before this but for his pilotage.[14]

Another whose encouragement had been an unfailing source of strength was his friend, the brilliant Channing. His high estimate of the permanent value of Mann's work is indicated in the following unpublished letter written a year before his death:

Newport, Sept. 26, 1841. My dear Sir. I thank you for the communication you made me not long ago of tidings from Mr. Combe—& when you write I beg you to convey to him my friendly remembrances. I wrote him not long ago. I should be glad to see the letter to which you refer, for he is a wise observer, & Dr. Potter told me that he had met no foreigner who understood Germany better or as well. That country is very interesting & full of anomalies—Under despotism there is much freedom of thought. With a plodding industry, they join wildest of speculation & imagination—& what is more striking, they are said to be licentious in the sexual relations & a moral people in other respects. Their intellectual influence on Europe is greater than that of other people. I wish Mr. Combe would help us to comprehend them.

Your account of the last report of the institute is encouraging. I rejoice that that body sympathizes with you & enters into the importance of your work. You have had a hard task, but more honorable for the discouraging circumstances under which you have carried it on. The great works of nature are in their first stages secret & draw no notice, & this is true of not a few social labors, on which the progress of the world chiefly depends. At this day, how idle or inferior are the questions which agitate the country—& which the multitude look to as matters of life & death—whilst the great agencies which are to decide the future, and to be felt when we are all forgotten, hardly perhaps draw a thought—To me there is no title in the Commonwealth so imposing as that of the Secretary of the B. of Ed.

I am truly sorry but not surprised to learn from Dr. Howe, that

[14] *Life*, p. 156. See also *The Letters and Journals of Samuel Gridley Howe*, Vol. II, in which are published a number of interesting letters which passed between these friends.

your strength is sinking under your labours—The rule is, when we have a warning of this kind, to stop at once—Your cause does not demand a martyr. You can serve it best by gaining strength—for I know no body to take your place. Dr. H. says he has proposed to you a foreign tour, and offered himself as a companion—This temptation I should think you hardly able to withstand. I hope you will not stop at half-means, which have done you little good, & make an entire change in your modes of life for a time. This is true economy of time, & your knowledge of the physical laws will leave you without excuse, if you go on to violate them. Very truly y—— friend Wm E Channing.

In spite of such a letter, from such a man, the presence of unabated opposition was a constant source of worry. This fact, when considered in relation to Mann's extremely sensitive nature and the state of his health, which was always bordering on collapse, helps to account for the following passage from his Journal, written after a disappointing interview with Governor Davis:

Called on the Governor, but found that his fears for personal popularity were outweighing all his interest in education; & that his course would be marked not by the intrinsic merits of the case but by its chance of making a vote, more or less, in his favor. This may seem a hard view to take of his conduct, but I believe it is a just one. When shall we have a man at the head of the government who can *do his duty,* & take the consequences? In the meantime, it imposes a most cruelly hard task upon me. With so much labor to perform, with so much opposition to encounter, & with so little help, & even so little sympathy, the alternative seems to be that of abandoning my post, or dying in the cause. Which shall be done? *The answer is registered in my mind, & need not be committed to paper.* If a true answer it will not need any paper testimony; if a false one, such testimony will only be my disgrace.

But viewed as a whole, the close of the year showed that the Board had made substantial gains. In their *Fifth Report,* dated January 1, 1842, a detailed report of the normal schools was made, and inasmuch as the contracts made for a term of three years, in connection with the establishment of the schools at

Lexington and Barre, would expire in 1842, a request was made for a legislative grant of funds for their continuance, and arguments were presented in support.

Mr. Mann, in his report to the Board, which, as formerly, was included in the Board's report to the legislature, laid emphasis on the need for a grant for school libraries, and stated that only three hundred sets of the School Library had thus far been purchased by the districts.[15]

Mann again referred to the subject of religious instruction in the schools, and said that while the law which prohibited the use of sectarian schoolbooks was being generally observed throughout the state, the reports of the school committees of Shirley and Harvard showed that in two Shaker communities in these towns the law was being disregarded, and that in Shirley the local society had refused to have its teacher examined by the town school committee, or to permit this committee to visit the school. One of the towns, in reporting the situation, called it a nullification of the school law. Mann pointed out the danger which would be certain to result from such action, were the example of these little homogeneous communities followed in towns where there were diversities of creeds.[16]

[15] *Fifth Report,* p. 79.

[16] *Ibid.,* pp. 65-69. A considerable portion of this report was devoted to showing the economic value of an education. With characteristic thoroughness, Mann supported his argument with letters from several employers of large numbers of men. In a letter to George Combe dated February 28, 1842, he said that his *Fifth Report* was mainly addressed to the "organ of acquisitiveness," and would therefore stand some chance of being popular. Its popularity is attested by the fact that the New York legislature printed eighteen thousand copies for distribution. It was also translated into German. See also *Life,* p. 162.

CHAPTER X

The Cause Gains Ground

THE year 1842 was to see a great advance in the cause of education. Four and a half years of severe labor, under conditions that were most trying, were now to be rewarded. At the beginning of the year, however, one disturbing threat was offered which showed that the enemy was at work. The following letter from William G. Bates, a member of the Board, explains the cause for anxiety:

Westfield Jany 15, 1842. My dear Sir. I sit down this evening to say a word in regard to the Board & to you. Friday evening, I had a conversation with a man from Pittsfd in regard to you both & was astonished at the sentiments which came from a former member of the Board. He thinks that it will be demolished this winter, without a doubt, that the Loco party will go for it; & that the Whigs will join them. He thinks that *all* members from Berkshire are against us. On learning his feelings, I went at once to Kellogg, of Pittsf^{d}—(and if you dont know him, know him soon) He is right! He says that N. knows nothing of the feeling of Berkshire. I had a further talk with Colby, Kinnicott & als. Colby is quite work^{d} up. K. is so of course—& if the devils dare to emerge, a good fight and a successful one will be waged. My friends are all of opinion that a regular party move ag$^{t.}$ us would blow them up! I was as much rejoiced to see such a feeling among our *party-men*, as I was pain$^{d.}$ to see a miserable feeling in the breast of a friend of Education—& I was on the whole gratified . . .

As to what I have said of Newton, I wish you would not speak, either to him or to any one, but I wish$^{d.}$ to put you on the guard, that you may counteract mischief . . . Most truly yr friend Bates.

The letter has a twofold interest. It throws light on the attitude of the Whigs toward the Board and Mann; a party move against them would be disastrous to the party. But it also shows that Newton, whose resignation in 1838 we have noted, was at

work spreading antagonism to the Board of Education. Subsequent events were to prove that his judgment as to the extent of the opposition was at fault.

There is no direct evidence to prove that Newton had been influenced by Packard, aside from the general impressions which he might have gained from hearing of the attack at New Bedford, and from reading Packard's written polemics. But in a postscript to his final letter to Mann, dated September 19, 1838,[1] Packard stated that he had friends on the Board of Education. Who they were is left to conjecture, though it would naturally be supposed that they would be found among the three Orthodox members, Davis, Robbins, and Newton; for it is not likely he would find any kindred spirits among the Unitarians on the Board. That the first two Orthodox members could not be depended upon to aid in the promotion of his plan was seen in Robbins' challenge at New Bedford, and in Davis' vigorous efforts to secure the suppression of the anonymous *Four Letters* which Packard had begun in the *New York Observer*. It is possible that Packard had these men in mind, and was mistaken as to how far they sympathized with him. But if this is not true, then we must conclude that he referred to Newton.

The situation in the legislature in 1842 was most fortunate for the Board and Mann. If the experiment of the normal schools were to be continued, a new legislative grant must be secured, and as we have noted, the *Fifth Report* requested grants for these schools, and also for school libraries. In a letter to his friend, George Combe of Scotland, dated February 28, 1842, Mann tells of the situation:

> In our Legislature, this winter, there is a very good feeling toward the Board and its movements. The Rev. Dr. Palfrey, editor of the "North-American Review," has cut theology, and become a politician. He is Chairman of the Committee on Education in the House. All the committees of both houses are friendly to the cause; my two best

[1] Appendix A, p. 284.

friends there, Mr. Quincy, and Mr. Kinnicut of Worcester, being respectively President of the Senate, and Speaker of the House. If they could not give me good committees, of what use would it be to have one's friends in these offices? A bill is now pending before the Legislature to grant further aid for the continuance of the Normal schools, and to encourage, by a small bonus, the respective districts of the State to purchase a small school-library. We have pretty strong hopes that it will pass.[2]

The bill was passed March 3, 1842, with large majorities in both Houses, 147 to 47 in the House, and 24 to 4 in the Senate. During the debate, Dr. Heman Humphrey, the Orthodox president of Amherst College, to whom Packard's *Four Letters* had been addressed, and who was now a member of the Board of Education, was quoted as having given the speaker, Senator Dickinson of Hampshire County, authority to say that he believed that the charges which certain Orthodox people had made that the Board had sectarian tendencies or purposes were without foundation. A report of the debate states that Senator Dickinson, who was also of the Orthodox faith, added that

> . . . he (Mr. Dickinson) thought that, after the proceedings of the Board had been before the public for five years, and nothing of an exceptional character, in this respect, could be found in them, it was proof of fanaticism in any member at the Senate board who could harbor any further suspicion upon the subject, or act, either avowedly or secretly, upon any such supposition.

The measure provided for a grant of $6,000 per year for three years for the normal schools, and fifteen dollars to each school district for a school library, with the condition that a like amount for this purpose should be raised by the district.[3]

This victory filled Mann with a joy that was almost unbounded. If his sensitive spirit could suffer keenest depression from a disappointing interview such as he had held with Gover-

[2] *Life*, p. 160. Corrected from copy of this letter in the "Mann Papers."
[3] *Common School Journal*, IV, 105.

nor Davis in December, he also had capacity for greatest rejoicing now that success had given assurance that the work was to be allowed to go on. We quote the following from the Journal:

March 3, 1842. The brightest days which have ever shone upon our cause, were yesterday and today. Yesterday, resolves passed the House for granting $6,000 per year for three years to the Normal schools; and fifteen dollars to each district for a school-library, on condition of its raising fifteen dollars for the same purpose.

Language cannot express the joy that pervades my soul, at this vast accession of power to that machinery which is to carry the cause of education forward, not only more rapidly than it has ever moved, but to places which it has never yet reached. This will cause an ever-widening circle to spread amongst contemporaries, and will project influences into the future to distances which no calculations can follow.

But I am too much exhausted to raise a song of gratulation that shall express my feelings. Yesterday I breakfasted at Salem; came to the city; found that all possible exertion was necessary; worked all day; and at evening went to lecture at Brookline, to fulfil an engagement; and returned at half-past nine, having spent the day without another meal. Today I have been hardly less busy, BUT THE GREAT WORK IS DONE! We must now use the power wisely with which we have been intrusted.[4]

The legislative grant for the normal schools was most opportune; for complications arose at Barre and Lexington which would have surely put an end to the experiment in these places, had a failure in state aid at this time made recourse to private support necessary.

At Barre, Professor Newman failed in health, and died in 1842. Efforts to fill his place failed. The Board offered the principalship to Rev. Calvin E. Stowe, of the Lane Theological Seminary, who declined. The contracts which had been made for three years with local people for maintaining the school expired and were not renewed. The village of Barre is about three

[4] See other Journal comments on this victory quoted in the *Life*, pp. 161, 162.

miles from the railroad station, and because of its inaccessibility it was believed that the school should be removed to some other point. A proposal was made to locate the school in Springfield, and Dr. Henry Barnard, whose work as Secretary of the State Board of Commissioners for Common Schools in Connecticut had just been terminated by the act of the legislature which abolished the Board and Secretaryship, was invited to become the principal. After careful consideration he declined, giving as his reason his belief that he was not fitted for the position. The school remained closed until 1844, when it was moved to Westfield, with the Orthodox minister, Dr. Emerson Davis, as principal.

At Lexington, the severe labor which, as we have seen, Mr. Peirce felt obliged to accomplish without assistance, brought its inevitable result, and his health failed in 1842. The offer of an assistant was refused, as Mr. Peirce felt that he could not continue under any conditions.[5] His resignation was reluctantly accepted, and Rev. Samuel J. May, a Unitarian minister, was appointed to the position.[6]

The appropriation made by the legislature for school libraries gave a great impetus to the Board's project. In the *Common School Journal,* issue of April 1, 1842, Mann published a copy of the Resolves together with an enthusiastic article on what he believed would be their far-reaching effects. They were "eventful of the fate of all coming time." Referring to the library, he said, "How many youth will such a library save who would

[5] The letters written by Mr. and Mrs. Peirce at this time are among the "Mann Papers."

[6] After a rest of two years "Father Peirce" returned to the principalship. The school was moved to West Newton, located in the building formerly occupied by the Fuller Academy which Mann had purchased with money given by Hon. Josiah Quincy, Jr. The Board had reluctantly allowed $500 in addition to local contributions, for fitting up the building; but under Peirce's supervision, a bill for $1850 was incurred. Mann and Peirce paid the difference out of their own pockets. See *Life,* pp. 232-236. See also an excellent article on Cyrus Peirce by S. J. May, in *American Educational Biography,* edited by Henry Barnard, p. 405.

otherwise grope in perpetual darkness, and, under the cravings of an unsatisfied mind, become misanthropes, or the pests of society!"[7] In the same number of the *Common School Journal* there was inserted an announcement of the School Library. Twenty-five volumes of the larger series were now published. In addition to the ten volumes announced in 1839, which had received the Board's approval, the following books were offered to the public:

The Useful Arts, two volumes, by Jacob Bigelow, M.D.
A Familiar Exposition of the Constitution of the United States, by Joseph Story, LL.D.
The Pursuit of Knowledge under Difficulties, two volumes, by Francis Wayland, D.D.
The Farmer's Companion, by the Hon. Jesse Buel.
Great Events, by Francis Lieber, LL.D.
The Fireside Friend, or Female Student, by Mrs. Phelps.
Importance of Practical Education and Useful Knowledge, by Edward Everett.
Letters on Astronomy, by Denison Olmsted, A.M.
The Principles of Science, by Alonzo Potter, D.D.
The History of the World, by Hon. Alexander H. Everett.

Twelve books of the Juvenile series which were also ready for the market were listed as follows:

Pictures of Early Life, by Mrs. Emma C. Embury.
Pleasures of Taste, selected from writings of Jane Taylor.
Means and Ends; or, Self-Training, by Miss Catherine M. Sedgwick.
The Juvenile Budget Opened, selected from writings of Dr. John Aikin.
Historic Tales for Youth, by Miss Mary E. Lee.
Things by their Right Names, selected from writings of Mrs. Barbauld.
Scenes in Nature.
Juvenile Budget Reopened, Selections from the Writings of Dr. John Aikin.

[7] IV, 97 ff.

Rambles about the Country, by Mrs. E. F. Ellet.
The Child's Friend, Selections from the Writings of Arnaud Berquin.
Lives of Columbus and Vespucius.
Lives of Vasco Nunez De Balboa, Hernando Cortes, and Francisco Pizarro.

The minutes of the Board show that on May 25, 1842, Mr. Mann and Mr. Rantoul were directed to make arrangements with the publishers, Webb and Company, to publish the Library on the same basis as that which had been made with Marsh, Capen, Lyon and Webb. The latter firm had been dissolved. The impulse which the legislative grant gave to the purchase of libraries now encouraged numerous publishing houses to prepare school libraries, a circumstance which, as we shall see, caused considerable embarrassment to the Board the following year, and was made an occasion of another attack in the legislature.

In addition to the appropriations for the normal schools and school libraries, there were other encouragements which signalized the year 1842 as the greatest which Mann and the Board had thus far experienced. Three gifts to the cause of education were made by public-spirited men. In Springfield Mr. John Chase gave one thousand dollars to beautify the grounds of the new school in the district where he lived. Hon. Stephen C. Phillips, ex-mayor of Salem, gave two thousand four hundred dollars to the public schools of that city to be used as the school committees should direct. Phillips was later appointed to the Board of Education and began his services in 1843.

The third gift was made by Hon. Martin Brimmer, the mayor-elect of Boston. At Mann's suggestion, Brimmer authorized him to purchase for every school in the State a copy of a recently published book, *School and Schoolmaster,* by Professor Alonzo Potter, D.D., of Union College, Schenectady, New York, and George B. Emerson of Boston.

A marked honor to Mr. Mann personally, as well as an added

recognition of the cause which he represented, came in an invitation from the authorities of the city of Boston to deliver the Fourth of July oration in 1842. Fully alive to the significance of the invitation, and the importance of the occasion, he prepared his address with elaborate care. On the eve of the eventful day he wrote in his Journal that while he feared he would not be able to satisfy some expectations which he had learned had been raised, he had prepared his oration as well as strength and time would permit, and that nothing remained but to submit it to the "terrible ordeal of public opinion." The orator gave a masterly survey of conditions in the life of the nation which made imperative the education of the rising generation, and pointed out the danger of ignorance in a country having a republican form of government. It was his conviction that with the founding of the Republic, many changes should have been made in our institutions. In speaking of the schools Mr. Mann again stated his position with regard to the teaching of religion:

I have said that schools should have been established for the education of the whole people. These schools should have been of a more perfect character than any which have ever yet existed. In them the principles of morality should have been copiously intermingled with the principles of science. Cases of conscience should have alternated with lessons in the rudiments. The multiplication table should not have been more familiar nor more frequently applied, than the rule, to do to others as we would that they should do unto us. The lives of great and good men should have been held up for admiration and example; and especially the life and character of Jesus Christ, as the sublimest pattern of benevolence, of purity, of self-sacrifice, ever exhibited to mortals. In every course of studies, all the practical and preceptive parts of the Gospel should have been sacredly included; and all dogmatical theology and sectarianism sacredly excluded. In no school should the Bible have been opened to reveal the sword of the polemic, but to unloose the dove of peace.[8]

[8] *Life and Works of Horace Mann,* IV, 365. The cordiality of the reception given the oration may be judged by the fact that at least two editions were published, one of 17,000 copies and another of 3,000.—*Life,* p. 165.

At the end of the year Mann regarded it as the most prosperous year the cause of education had seen. As the new year opened before him, he wrote in his Journal:

> Jan. 1, 1843. A new year! The past year is now beyond mortal or immortal control. To me, to the cause I have most at heart, it has been a most auspicious year. Event after event has occurred to give that cause an impulse; and I do not recollect anything of untoward character which is worthy to be mentioned. The grant for the libraries and for Normal schools, the increase of the town appropriations, the increasing interest felt in the subject by the people, and the well-timed donation of Mr. Brimmer of a work on education for all the schools in the State, attest the prosperity of the cause for the last year.
>
> But another year now opens. The great subject of inquiry now is, What fortunes await the cause before it shall close? This inquiry I cannot answer, any further than to say, that what depends on human exertion shall not be wanting to its prosperity. I may die in the cause; but, while I live, I will uphold it to the utmost of my strength.

The note of anxiety in the closing sentences was not wholly unwarranted. The political situation had changed once more, and the Democrat, Marcus Morton, had again been elected Governor. Arthur B. Darling states that the deciding issue which elected Morton and placed the Democrats in control of the legislature was that of free suffrage, growing out of sympathy with the poor classes in Rhode Island whose struggle for the franchise had resulted in the "Dorr War" in 1842.[9]

The Governor's inaugural address delivered January 20, 1843, was disappointing to the friends of the educational movement. As in 1840, he urged that the fullest measure of control and management of the schools be given to the districts. He feared that the common town schools had not kept pace with other institutions of learning. While "the greatest practicable degree of equality" was required by the genius of our government in the education of its citizens, he said he feared "that the inequality

[9] Darling, pp. 286-289. See also Arthur M. Mowry: *The Dorr War, or the Constitutional Struggle in Rhode Island.*

instead of diminishing, increases with the advancement of knowledge and science." The Board and its Secretary, and their achievements were entirely ignored. Criticism was made of the provision of the Resolve of March 3, 1842, granting fifteen dollars for a school library to each district which should raise a like sum for this purpose. Morton said the law was partial and unjust for the reason that it favored the wealthy and populous districts, which did not need this aid, and discriminated against those weaker districts which were unable to raise the fifteen dollars necessary to meet the conditions of the grant. He also declared himself opposed to the policy which he said the legislature had followed in issuing scrip based on the school fund in order to loan money to corporations. This he regarded as threatening the safety of the school fund.

The Governor's slight was felt keenly, and was reflected in Mann's comment in his Journal:

Jan. 22 . . . This week, Governor Morton has come into power, and commenced his course by a most insidious and Jesuitical speech. He speaks of education; but not one word is said of the Board, or of the Normal Schools. There is no recognition of the existence of improvements effected by them. Six years of as severe labor as any mortal ever performed—labor too, which has certainly been rewarded by great success—cannot procure a word of good will. This denial of justice, this *suppressio veri,* is of no consequence, only as it may prevent our doing as much as we otherwise might. But, if allowed to continue, a noble revenge shall be wrought,—that of making it apparent to the most prejudiced and unjust that much has been done.

Morton's speech was answered by the Whig members, as had been done in 1840. Referring to the Governor's fears regarding the alleged failure to improve the schools, the Whigs said:

He knew that the whole time and talents of an eminently gifted individual had been devoted for six years to the object of elevating and improving them, yet he fears that his work has not only failed to progress; but that affairs are absolutely in a more desperate condition than when he commenced. If his Excellency will take the trouble to

look at the abstracts of the school returns, they will show him that in hundreds of towns the reports of school committees to their fellow citizens who can judge of their truth, are filled with eulogiums of the advance and increasing utility of these schools. We are told that they are taking the place of private schools and rising in importance with all classes of men. The returns themselves shew upon their face the fallacy of his Excellency's fears.[10]

Statistics from the Abstract of the school returns prepared by Mann were presented to show that in the amount of taxes raised for the support of the schools, there had been an advance of more than 33 per cent since 1837. During the same period, more than a half million dollars had been spent in building and repairing schoolhouses, as well as not less than twenty thousand dollars for libraries and apparatus. The number of schools had increased from 2,918 in 1837, to 3,198 in 1842, a gain of 280; while the number of teachers had increased 821. The average length of time spent in school in 1837 had been six months and twenty-five days; in 1842 it was seven months and eighteen days.

In reply to the Governor's criticism that the law granting funds for school libraries was unjust to poorer districts, the Whigs pointed out that the discrimination was actually in the other direction. Many of the large villages and towns were organized as one district, and hence were entitled, by the terms of the law, to receive only fifteen dollars, though the district often contained many schools. The *Address* of the Whigs named the towns that had not applied for the grant, and showed that in most cases these were the wealthier and more populous communities, while the poorer districts had received the funds from the treasury. No claim had been made from Suffolk County.

Morton's expression of fear for the safety of the school fund was met by an explicit denial of any danger. The Whigs re-

[10] *Address of the Whig Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of Massachusetts, to their Constituents, occasioned by the inaugural address of His Excellency, Marcus Morton,* p. 24.

minded him that several years before, the State had subscribed for ten thousand shares of stock valued at one million dollars, in the Western Railroad Corporation (now the Boston and Albany Railroad), to be paid for by funds realized from the sale of the State's scrip to be issued to run for twenty years at 5 per cent. In 1841-1842 it became necessary to raise $200,000 to meet an installment of the subscription then due. But the scrip already issued had fallen below par, because United States bonds, at 6 per cent, were being offered at par and under. The State had to choose between selling additional scrip far below par, thus sustaining a loss, or finding elsewhere the funds immediately needed. One hundred thousand dollars of the school fund, which amount was then lying idle, was therefore borrowed for this purpose, and the State, in return, paid to the school fund one hundred and ten thousand dollars of the scrip at 5 per cent. The Whigs maintained that the State's finances had thereby been preserved, and that the school fund had profited by the transaction. The State could be trusted to redeem the scrip held by the school fund, just as truly as it could be relied upon to honor its debts owed to other purchasers. Morton's criticism was scored because it was believed his words would injure the State's credit.

Time proved that the Governor's fears in this case were not well founded. The stock in the Western Railroad was a good investment and the school fund did not suffer from the use to which it had been put.

Morton's speech appears to have had little direct effect upon the Board and their work. No evidence has been found to indicate that any movements, such as those in 1840 and 1841, to abolish the Board and Secretaryship were started, although a Democratic legislature was in power.

The old question of the Massachusetts School Library was soon raised again, however, and finally led to another test of strength in the legislature. We have noted that the Resolve of

March 3, 1842, which appropriated funds for the purchase of school libraries, encouraged various publishing houses to prepare sets of books for this purpose, and that in May, 1842, the Board had made an agreement with the publishers, Thomas Webb and Company, similar to the one which had existed with the old firm, Marsh, Capen, Lyon and Webb, before that firm had dissolved partnership. Webb and Company, in some of their advertisements of the Library, which they now published under the Board's sanction, aroused the antagonism of other publishers not similarly favored. At the same time, the impression became current that the Board had given their sanction to the publications of other houses. The Board therefore believed it necessary to explain their position, and accordingly published a statement in their *Sixth Report*. They reviewed the course which had been followed from the beginning in selecting the library, and the statements made with reference to it in the various Reports since 1839. They were careful to show that in recommending the Library to the districts, they had never attempted to compel its adoption, but rather that they believed they were performing a needed service in selecting books which would be acceptable. Moreover, they had no pecuniary interest in the project. After stating that the recent grant for school libraries had encouraged several publishing houses to select books for this purpose, the Board made it clear that they had given their approval to the School Library only, which had at first been published by Marsh, Capen, Lyon and Webb, and was now being published by Webb and Company. They had neither recommended the other libraries, nor opposed their introduction into the schools.[11] In his Report to the Board, Mann recommended that a supplementary Resolve be passed by the legislature to make it possible for towns and cities not divided into separate districts to secure libraries for their schools with the State's bounty.

[11] *Sixth Report*, pp. 7-12.

Governor Davis, retiring from office, refused to sign the *Sixth Report*. In a letter to Lieutenant Governor Hull, dated January 20, 1843, he gave as his reason for declining his signature the fact that he had been unable to give sufficient attention to the work of the Board to know about the matters which were treated in the Report. Hull also refused to sign and handed the Governor's letter to Mann. In a letter written to Mann by William G. Bates, dated January 31, 1843, he named James as a third member whose signature was withheld, but Bates gave no reason for James' refusal. Whether or not the refusal of these three men to sign the Report was due in part to the fact that the School Library, about which there was so much difference of opinion, was treated at length, we cannot determine. We know that James, a Democrat, had been appointed to the Board in 1840 by Morton, who was again Governor, and whose opposition to the Library had caused much anxiety during his first term of office.

There now developed in the legislature an embarrassing complication growing out of the impression which had become current that the Board had given their approval to several of the Libraries which had recently been put on the market. On January 31, 1843, the *Mercantile Journal* of Boston published an article condemning a volume, *Elegant Extracts,* one of the books in a school library recently prepared by a Boston firm. The writer of the article stated that the book contained many passages which were profane, vulgar, and obscene. On February 7, Dr. Palfrey, chairman of the Committee on Education in the House, stated that the Board of Education had given their certificate of approval of two hundred and fifty books for school libraries, published by several firms, and that thirty-two copies of one book which had been sold had been found to contain offensive matter and had been called in. On the following day Webb and Company, who were publishing the Massachusetts School Library under the Board's sanction, wrote to Mann in-

quiring whether or not Palfrey's statement were true. The only answer to this question that has been found is the Board's own statement in their *Sixth Report,* which, as we learn from an entry in Mann's Journal, was not printed until after March 5, nearly a month after the date of Palfrey's remarks in the House. We have seen that in the Board's statement they declared that the only books they had approved were those of the Massachusetts School Library, published by Webb and Company. Dr. Palfrey was editor of the *North American Review* and was friendly to the Board and Mann. The only explanation to account for his remarks seems to be that he had been misinformed.

The *Boston Recorder,* in commenting on the unfortunate publication of the book, said:

> Nothing is to be more deprecated—unless it be the circulation of those of a professedly religious tendency, which yet evince no love nor respect for "Christ and him crucified."[12]

The unpleasant affair just related appears not to have resulted in any harm to the cause of education. A satisfactory explanation doubtless was given; for on February 18, a measure embodying the recommendation made by Mr. Mann in the *Sixth Report* was adopted by the House. It provided that the Resolve of March 3, 1842, which granted fifteen dollars for a library to every district which would raise an equal amount for this purpose, should be extended to towns and cities not divided into districts. The new measure granted to such towns and cities "as many times fifteen dollars as the number sixty is contained, exclusive of fractions, in the number of children between four and sixteen years of age." Each town or city receiving the grants must raise an equal sum for the same purpose. After the Resolve was passed to a third reading, Dr. Palfrey moved that the rules be suspended, and the measure was passed to be engrossed.[13]

[12] *Boston Recorder,* Feb. 9, 1843.
[13] *Boston Daily Advertiser and Patriot,* Feb. 21, 1843.

Mann's account of the passage of the Resolve, and his view of the gain the educational movement had recently made, is reported in the Journal:

Feb. 19 . . . Yesterday the whole question of the school-libraries was opened again in the House of Representatives, and was sustained by a *crushing* majority. So the cause has evidently advanced almost incredibly within two or three years. It now needs discreet and energetic management: it will then be able to take care of itself.

Nearly two weeks later, on March 3, a motion in the Senate to inquire into the expediency of repealing the law relating to school libraries was defeated by a vote of fifteen to five.[14]

The victory for the Library is the more notable because of the fact that it was won in a Democratic legislature, which was committed to a policy of economy. At Governor Morton's suggestion, a committee on retrenchment had been appointed which made a careful examination of salaries and other expenditures, and presented a report which recommended a general reduction in salaries. The committee's recommendations were incorporated into the law which was passed March 7, 1843.[15]

Mann's salary was one of the few which escaped. His experience with this committee is related in an amusing extract from a letter to his sister, Miss Lydia B. Mann. It bears the date of March 15, 1843:

On the whole we have got along better this winter than I feared. The Retrenchment committee passed all offices & all salaries in the State in review, & tho' they abolished some, & cut deeply into the compensation of others, yet they suffered the Board of Education to escape. Their plan prevailed without the slightest amendment,—nobody whom they had doomed escaping. On the last day in which that subject was debated, the House sat till past one o'clock in the morning, & finally consummated their work. On the next morning, I went to a surgeon to see if my own head was on. It was pronounced unde-

[14] *Boston Daily Advertiser and Patriot*, March 4, 1843.
[15] *Supplement to the Revised Statutes*, I, Chap. 9, 1843.

capitated, & undislocated in the neck. I then trusted we were safe. But a few days afterwards, an old mouser introduced an order requiring this same Retrenchment Committee to consider the expediency of applying the shears to one side of my salary, & see if some valuable clippings could not be obtained therefrom. The friends of the cause looked upon this with some alarm, but the committee soon reported unanimously against interfering, & so the matter now stands. The truth is that the cause has now taken such deep hold of the public mind, that the politicians do not think it safe to attack it. This is not the best ground of security, but it is better than none.

This incident marks the end of any effective opposition to the Board and Mr. Mann in the legislature. The resort to political action, urged by Packard, had failed in the two attacks of 1840 and 1841. The constructive measures, providing for funds for the normal schools and libraries, had been won in 1842 and 1843, against all opposition. The confidence of many Orthodox people whose fears had been aroused was beginning to be restored. Mann and the Board had consistently held to a literal interpretation of the Law of 1827, and, though they had no direct authority, had refused to give their approval to any attempt to introduce sectarianism into the schools. With a man of such unquestioned Orthodoxy as President Humphrey on the Board of Education, suspicions of any such "design" as Dr. Storrs believed he saw in the founding of the normal schools were slowly disappearing. Because of this confidence, as well as the success of their constructive measures, the position of Horace Mann and the Board was much stronger in 1843 than when Packard began his campaign of opposition in 1838.

In May, 1843, Mr. Mann sailed for Europe. While he had been disarming opposition at home, his constructive work, especially as seen in his first six Reports, and the *Supplementary Report on Schoolhouses,* had won for him a name in many parts of the United States and even in England. He now decided to spend six months studying the schools of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and several countries on the Continent, including Ger-

many, France, Holland, and Belgium.[16] He went at his own expense, having obtained from members of the Board a leave of absence. His going to Europe for a stay of six months in 1843 is of significance at this point in our narrative because it reveals a degree of confidence and security which had not heretofore existed. It is true that the legislature would not be in session during this period of the year, yet it is worth noting that Mann evidently considered the cause of education so well established that his absence of six months would not put it in jeopardy.

[16] On May 1, 1843, Mr. Mann was married for a second time. His wife, who was Miss Mary Peabody, a sister of Mrs. Nathaniel Hawthorne, accompanied him to Europe. Among the fellow passengers were Mann's intimate friends, Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe, with his bride, Julia Ward Howe, and Rev. and Mrs. Jacob Abbott. See also *Abbott's Young Christian,* memorial edition, New York, 1882, pp. 72 ff. and *Letters and Journals of Samuel Gridley Howe,* II, 125.

CHAPTER XI

Religious Aspects of Other Controversies

HORACE MANN never made any public reply to Packard's attacks. During his first seven years in office he refused to be drawn into controversy, although frequent newspaper articles and an occasional speaker kept alive the suspicions of many. But in 1844 two attacks were brought against him which were so serious that he deemed it necessary to answer them. He also replied to a third which was made in 1846. These controversies, which attracted wide attention, will be summarized here.

I. *The Controversy with Newton.*

It will be remembered that Edward A. Newton of Pittsfield, one of the first members of the Board of Education, and a member of the Episcopal church, resigned his position in 1838, because he was opposed to the Board's plans to secure the publication of the Massachusetts School Library. We also saw that in 1842 Newton was active in spreading opposition to the Board.

During Mr. Mann's trip abroad in 1843, he spent some time in England. Frequent entries in his Journal indicate that he was deeply impressed by the hold which the Established Church had upon education at that time. Upon returning home he published two articles in the *Common School Journal* in which he condemned the Church of England for its attitude, and said:

> The only reason why there has not, long ago, been a system of public instruction in England, is, because the church steadfastly resists all legal provisions for literary and moral education unless it can control it for the purpose of proselytism.[1]

[1] *Common School Journal,* VI, 18.

In his *Seventh Report* he again referred to England's need of a national system of education, and commented unfavorably upon the teaching of sectarian doctrines of religion in the schools of England, Scotland, and Prussia.[2]

On February 23, 1844, there appeared in the *Christian Witness and Church Advocate,* the organ of the Episcopalians, published in Boston, an unsigned communication in which the writer asked the question:

> Can anyone tell wherein the system of Mr. Girard, and the present system of our "Board of Education," or rather of its Secretary, differs; or where the *essential* line of agreement, varies?

Attention was called to Daniel Webster's argument made before the Supreme Court, a few days before, in the famous Girard case. The relatives of Stephen Girard had attempted to break his will whereby he had made provision for the founding of a college for orphan boys. Webster argued that Mr. Girard's plan, which proposed to eliminate all sectarian religious influences from the institution, and which prohibited clergymen of all sects from entering the gates of the college, was based upon Paine's *Age of Reason* and Volney's *Views of Religion,* and that it "laid the axe at the root of Christianity itself."[3] The writer stated that he desired to "draw the attention of Christians of all denominations, holding Orthodox creeds" to the "grave question" he had asked.

The writer of the communication was Edward A. Newton. Although he did not sign his name, the fact that he was the author soon became known, and in a second letter to the *Witness,* which appeared in the issue of May 17, he signed his initials, "E.A.N."

In the controversy which followed the appearance of Newton's

[2] *Seventh Report,* pp. 37-47, 170 ff.

[3] It is interesting to find that Frederick A. Packard was for several years a director of Girard College, and twice declined an invitation to become its president. See *Princeton Review,* Index Volume, 1871, p. 267.

first letter, Mann wrote three communications defending the position of himself and the Board. The editor of the *Witness*, M. A. De Wolfe Howe, published several editorials, and writers in various newspapers in the state commented on the charges which had been brought against Mann and the Board. The most important articles written on both sides of the question were gathered up and printed in a pamphlet entitled *The Common School Controversy*.[4]

The substance of Newton's charges, which were seconded by the *Witness*, was as follows. The system of instruction in the Massachusetts public schools, which Newton affirmed was the system of the Board and its Secretary, did not differ in any essential point from Mr. Girard's system, which was drawn from Paine's *Age of Reason* and Volney's *Views of Religion*. The Law of 1827 had been passed after a new sect had sprung up. Its object had been to exclude from the schools the teaching of divergent theories of church organization, discipline, and doctrines regarding the sacraments. But no one thought much of this law, even if it were intended to be operative, until the appointment of the Board and its Secretary in 1837. Their construction of the law made it exclude the Assembly's Catechism and the "great doctrines of the gospel" which had been taught without opposition in the schools for nearly two hundred years. The Library prepared by the Board would not include the works of Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, Knox, Wesley, and Fuller. Although the Bible might be read, it could not be explained or taught. Moreover, if a Papist should become a member of the Board, he could object to the use of the Protestants' translation of the Bible as sectarian. The teaching of anything less than the evangelical doctrines of the gospel was itself sectarian, and the system of education advocated by the Board and Mann was an "excrescence" upon the original common school system. Although a majority of the Board were Orthodox, still they could

[4] For the full title, see p. 23, note.

easily be controlled by the Secretary who furthered his plans by means of his annual reports, the *Common School Journal,* and the normal schools. The report made by the majority of the Committee on Education in the legislature in 1840 was cited with approval. The Board was *"wholly useless and burdensome as a State institution,"* and should be abolished. The Puritan system of Orthodox religious instruction must be restored in the schools.

In reply, Mr. Mann pointed out that whereas no clergymen were permitted to enter Girard College, five of the eight members of the Massachusetts Board of Education were clergymen, three of whom were Orthodox, and that two of the lay members were also Orthodox. A large majority of the members of the school committees in the Massachusetts towns were clergymen, and the school law required that these committees must enter each district school at least twice a year, and must visit each school kept by the town at least once a month. In contrast with the requirement that the boys in Girard College must receive all their instruction at the institution, the children in Massachusetts schools were at liberty to receive religious instruction in the home, the Sunday school, and the services of the church. So far from approving Paine's *Age of Reason* and Volney's *Views of Religion,* from which it was asserted by Mr. Webster that Girard had drawn his system, Mr. Mann called attention to the fact that he had denounced these books on page 74 of his *Third Report.*

Mann refuted the statement that the Massachusetts public school system was the system of the Board and himself. It was the system defined by the Constitution and the laws of the state, a system which, so far as their legal duties extended, the Board and the Secretary were bound to administer just as truly as the judges of the Supreme Court administered the laws of the state. The Board and Secretary had no more power to modify the system than the judges had to change the statute book. Newton's

appeal was from the Orthodox to the Orthodox; the law forbidding the introduction of sectarian schoolbooks, which had been passed in 1827, was reënacted in 1835, almost unanimously, by a legislature, many of whose members were Orthodox, and was signed by acting Governor Samuel T. Armstrong, an Orthodox gentleman.

To Newton's contention that the Board and Mann had driven the Assembly's Catechism from the schools, Mann made a reply that is of great value to this study:

> Now, I appeal to every man possessed of intelligence, on this subject, for a denial of these statements. In the nine eastern counties of the State, containing more than five eighths of its population, the teaching of the Assembly's Catechism and of Orthodox doctrines, had been, not entirely, but mainly discontinued, long before the existence of the Board. The Catechism had been objected to by the Orthodox Baptists themselves. In many places, the discontinuance dates back, at least, to the beginning of the present century. I have met with many persons, educated in our schools, who never saw the Assembly's Catechism. So convinced was public sentiment of the equity and justice of the law of 1827, against sectarian teaching in the schools, that in all the common school conventions I have ever attended, in almost all of which the subject of moral and religious instruction has been introduced, there has been but one instance where such teaching was advocated; and there it was resisted on the spot, by an Orthodox clergyman.
>
> Another ground of disproof is this: The whole current of testimony contained in the school committees' reports, denies the right and disclaims the desire to introduce sectarianism into the schools. Of more than a thousand of these reports, there are but two of a contrary description. They began to be made the next year after the establishment of the Board. Surely such a change could never have been wrought in a single year. These reports are all on file. The School Abstracts, containing the substance and spirit of them, are in the hands of all the school committees, of which Mr. Newton has been one. And yet in defiance of all these facts, known, or capable of being known by himself, he makes these assertions.[5]

[5] *The Common School Controversy*, p. 26.

Newton's statement that the Law of 1827 was meant to exclude the teaching of "ecclesiastical systems of church government and discipline" was shown not to be founded in fact. Insisting that the law was intended to exclude sectarian instruction from the schools, Mann said that whether Newton's construction was right or wrong, it was at least original; for it had never been suggested before by anyone.

In his own defense, Mr. Mann stated that the members of the Board, Orthodox and Liberals alike, had approved every measure of the Board. By them he had been annually reëlected, and under them he had done his work. After seven years of existence the work of the Board could now be judged by its record. In addition to large material gains in the schools, and marked improvement in the modes of instruction, the Bible was much more widely read than was the case in 1837. "Thirty fold more of instruction in morality and religious truth" was being given in the schools than had been taught seven years before, though Mann considered that this fell far short of what was needed. Although the Board and the Secretary had no power to prescribe schoolbooks for the schools, Mann had recently published in the *Common School Journal*[6] an extract from a lecture by President Humphrey in which he urged the devotional reading of the Bible in the schools and also its use as a class book. Moreover, in the normal schools where the Board had full power, it was required that a portion of the Scriptures should be read every day.

It was pointed out that the Bible was in nearly all of the schools. It was read without note or comment. But if Newton's proposal, to have it interpreted and to have the Orthodox doctrines taught, should be carried out, then the five thousand teachers for the schools must be selected with care to insure that those of the right faith would be in the schools. Such a condition of affairs could only be brought about by legislative action, and the result would amount to a system which would in

[6] *Common School Journal,* VI, 50-53.

no wise differ from an established religion. Mr. Newton had been born too late, it was said. His was the spirit of Henry the Eighth, but without his power.

One of the most valuable documents produced by the controversy is the letter from Mr. Samuel M. Burnside of Worcester, who was the framer of the Law of 1827. We have already quoted at length from this letter,[7] and need only to remind ourselves that Mr. Burnside flatly contradicted the construction placed by Newton on that law. He stated that it was intended to prevent the town school committee from introducing into the schools any books teaching "doctrinal subjects of dogmatic theology," and explained that the law was reported by a committee the majority of whom he believed were Orthodox and passed by the legislature with practically no opposition. Mr. Burnside was careful to add that the law was intended to be a measure to protect the schoolroom from becoming "the battle ground of polemic combatants."

The compiler of the newspaper articles in this controversy states that only one paper in the state appeared to take sides with Newton and the *Witness*. This was the *Christian Reflector*, a Baptist paper, which, in a second article, disclaimed any approval of the action of the *Witness*.

The following extract from a letter written by Mann to George Combe in April, 1844, is a commentary on the controversy, and indicates that the opposition of Newton and the *Witness* was not generally supported even by members of their own church, and that most of the other denominations did not sympathize with the instigators of the attack:

> My Report, generally speaking, has met with unusual favor; but there are owls, who, to adapt the world to their own eyes, would always keep the sun from rising. Most teachers amongst us have been animated to greater exertions by the account of the best schools abroad. Others are offended at being driven out of the paradise which

[7] See pp. 24-26.

their own self-esteem had erected for them, & have been actuated by the feelings of Iago, when he said "There is a daily beauty in *his* life that makes me ugly."

The Episcopalians here have always borne me a grudge because I have condemned the spirit of the English Church in denying all education to the people, which they could not pervert to the purposes of proselytism. After the appearance of the first two numbers of my Journal this year, and of my Report, a regular attack was commenced upon me in a paper which is the organ of that sect, and published in Boston. Of course, they had too much craft to avow the real grounds of their hostility, but fabricated charges, in regard to which they excited the sympathy of others. Hence they were in the false position of a man who acts from one set of motives, while he avows another. The reasons given in such cases never correspond with the feelings manifested or the charges made. A man who fires in that way can never take good aim; and so, of course, misses the mark. These attacks became so virulent, that I at last replied. My first reply was admitted into the paper that had brought forward the accusation; and the editor accompanied it with remarks so weak and wicked, that I replied to those. This last communication he refused to admit. I then published it in another paper. Both of my articles have been extensively copied into other papers; and, as far as I can learn, I have almost all the other denominations on my side, and even the great mass of the Episcopalians themselves. Though I am considered as having kept down my temper pretty well, for one of the uncircumcised Philistines, yet some writers, who have espoused my cause in the newspapers, have opened all the batteries of destructiveness upon them.

On the whole, it is believed that this will be the last effort of orthodoxy to secure the admission of its doctrines into our schools.[8]

The effect on Mr. Mann's health of the criticism during this controversy may be judged from the following extract from a letter to Dr. E. Jarvis on February 10, 1844:

Can you do anything for a brain that has not slept for three weeks? I can feel the flame in the centre of my cranium, blazing and flaring round just as you see that of a pile of brush burning on a distant heath in the wind. What can be done to extinguish it?[9]

[8] *Life,* pp. 225, 226, corrected from a copy of this letter in the "Mann Papers."

[9] *Ibid.,* p. 224.

II. *The Controversy with the Boston Schoolmasters.*

The second attack which was launched against Mr. Mann in 1844 resulted in the famous controversy with the Boston schoolmasters. This controversy also grew out of opposition created by the *Seventh Report* in which Mann had presented the results of his study of the European schools. On September 1, 1844, a pamphlet of one hundred and forty-four pages was issued by a committee of the Principals' Association, an organization of the masters of the Boston grammar schools. It was entitled, *Remarks on the Seventh Annual Report of the Hon. Horace Mann, Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education,* and was signed by thirty-one of the masters.

The *Remarks* were divided into four sections. The first division was a bitter arraignment of Mann and the Board of Education. Mann was condemned as a theorist without experience as a practical educator. The normal schools were attacked because it was maintained that they were to be used for propaganda purposes in advancing his theories. The whole section was abusive and full of misrepresentations. The second section dealt with the Prussian modes of instruction which had been discussed in the *Report*. In the third division, forty-seven pages were devoted to the subject of teaching reading. Mann had advocated the "Word" method, to which the Boston masters were opposed. The last section treated the question of school discipline, and it was around this subject that the battle was most severe.

Mr. Mann's reply[10] was ready in October, but was delayed by difficulties in connection with printing until November fifteenth. To this reply twenty-nine of the masters[11] brought out in Febru-

[10] *Reply to the "Remarks" of Thirty-one Boston Schoolmasters on the Seventh Annual Report of the Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education.*

[11] Two of the masters had withdrawn from the controversy; one, William J. Adams, of the Hancock School, made a public retraction of his part in the attack.

ary, 1845, a rejoinder.[12] Mann's answer[13] to this rejoinder was most severe, and effectively silenced the schoolmasters.

It is not necessary for us to examine in detail the various issues in this controversy; Dr. B. A. Hinsdale[14] has treated them at length in a chapter devoted to the subject. But there is one aspect of the controversy which deserves careful attention.

On July 30, 1844, a month before the appearance of the Schoolmasters' *Remarks,* Mr. Mann wrote to George Combe that a new conflict was impending. He stated that he had sent to Combe a copy of the pamphlet, *The Common School Controversy,* in which the letters and newspaper articles relating to the controversy with Newton and the *Christian Witness* had been published, and he continued:

If you have received it, you will see that we have been engaged in a struggle here on the question of *doctrinal* teaching in our public schools. The account, in my last Report, of how religion is forced down the throats, and thus introduced into the circulation of children abroad, has started some of our fanatical people, who think it is necessary first to put me down, that they may afterwards carry out their plans of introducing doctrines into our schools. What I said of religious teaching in the English, Scotch, and Prussian schools, would, as I thought, be an antidote against attempting the same things here. With the ultra-orthodox it has proved just the reverse. They say, "Why cannot we do here as they do there?" They know by experience that the Bible never effects the teaching of their views, *unless they send an interpreter with it.* Therefore they are determined an interpreter shall accompany it; and, if this is not done forthwith, they think it will be too late. I speak advisedly, and from the best authority, when I say that an extensive conspiracy is now formed to break down the Board of Education, as a preliminary measure to teaching sectarianism in

[12] *Rejoinder to the "Reply" of the Hon. Horace Mann, Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, to the "Remarks" of the Association of Boston Masters, upon his Seventh Annual Report.*

[13] *Answer to the "Rejoinder" of Twenty-nine Boston Schoolmasters, part of the "Thirty-one" who published "Remarks" on the Seventh Annual Report of the Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education.*

[14] B. A. Hinsdale: *Horace Mann and the Common School Revival in the United States,* Chap. VIII.

the schools. The latter they can never effect; but the former, it is not impossible they will do. But it will not do to present this bold ground as the basis of the attack. They can have an understanding between themselves in regard to this, but make the charge on other pretences. One of the other means is to impugn the accuracy of my Report on certain points. . . . The best portion of the orthodox are with us, who may possibly ward off the impending danger; but you know how feeble is the control which reason can exercise over fanaticism.[15]

In his *Seventh Report* Mr. Mann had laid stress on the absence of corporal punishment in the German schools. The subject of school discipline was one which deeply interested him, and for years he had opposed corporal punishment except as a last resort when all higher means had failed. The fourth section of the *Remarks* insisted that all discipline must be based upon authority. There must be an "unconditional surrender" to the authority of the teacher, and Saint Paul's injunction was cited in support of this position:

Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God.[16]

To this defense of corporal punishment Mann made a severe reply. He recognized that there were cases where a final resort to the rod would be necessary; but these should be exceptional. Appeal should be made to the interests of the child, and to conscience, to love for parents, brothers, and sisters; to the motives of justice, respect for elders, the pleasures of acquiring knowledge, to duty, and to "the connection between present conduct, and success, estimation, eminence, in future life, the presence of the unseen eye . . ." In contrasting his own with his opponents' position, Mann repeatedly emphasized the words "unconditional surrender," "authority," and "fear," found in the *Remarks*.

But in spite of his severity, there would not appear to be a great divergence of opinion between him and the writer of this

[15] *Life*, pp. 228-230.

[16] *Romans* 13 : 1, 2.

section of the *Remarks,* were it not known that the latter was defending a practice which was greatly abused in the Boston schools. As the controversy developed and the widespread abuse of corporal punishment became known—an abuse that included the flogging of girls as well as boys—the public was aroused and reforms were insisted upon.

In concluding his *Reply,* Mann reviews some of the difficulties which he has met. Among them he mentions opposition from teachers, owners of private schools, politicians, and booksellers. In this connection, he mentions the School Library, in regard to which he says there had been "a greater unanimity of opinion among the people of Massachusetts than on any other subject connected with our school system." In a footnote he adds the most direct reference to the Packard episode that appears in any of his published works:

> The most persevering and unprincipled opposition I have ever encountered, originated in my declining to recommend, for adoption in the Common Schools of Massachusetts, a highly sectarian library, prepared in another State.[17]

Mann says that so far as he knows, no one has ever been a candidate for the office he holds. Although some men have tried to get him out, "nobody has tried to get in." He is determined that so long as he remains in the office, it shall be administered in keeping with the law, with justice and impartiality to all:

> One thing, however, let me say;—no consideration whatever shall induce me to remain in this office any longer than while its duties can be administered on the same broad principles of impartiality and justice, towards all parties and denominations in the State, on which they have hitherto been administered. The Board of Education was not established to show favor or disfavor to any one political or religious party, as it regards other political or religious parties. I believe it is their wish, as it certainly is my wish, that the fundamental principles of our republican government should be unfolded in our schools; but

[17] *Reply,* p. 168.

not that teachers should espouse either side of the great controverted questions in politics,—either as to measures or men,—on which the nation is now divided.[18]

He definitely states that he wishes to have the Bible used in the schools, and expresses his faith in the following language:

I believe it is their wish, as it is mine, that the Bible should continue to be used in our schools; but still, that it shall be left with the local authorities,—where the law now leaves it,—to say, in what manner, in what classes, &c., it shall be used. I suppose it to be their belief, as it is mine, that the Bible makes known to us the rule of life and the means of salvation; and that, in the language of the apostle, it is a "faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners"; but still, that it would be a flagrant transgression of our duty to select any one of those innumerable guide-boards,—whether pointing forward, right, left, or backward,—which fallible men have set up along the way, and to proclaim that the kingdom of heaven is only to be sought for in that particular direction. Such, according to the letter and the spirit of our constitution and laws, is the Common School System of Massachusetts; and, until the constitution or laws shall be altered, it will continue to be the duty of all school officers, steadily and firmly, and upon these impartial and truly Republican principles, to administer that system, however fiercely they may be assailed therefor, by political or religious bigots, by Malice or Mammon.[19]

During a lull in the storm, Mann wrote on December 1 a letter to his friend George Combe, in which he gave an account of the attack. The following is an extract:

The orthodox have hunted me this winter as though they were blood-hounds, and I a poor rabbit. They feel that they are losing strength, and that the period even for regaining it is fast passing out of their hands. Hence they are making a desperate struggle. They feel in respect to a free education, that opens the mind, develops the conscience, and cultivates reverence for whatever is good without the infusion of Calvinistic influence, as the old monks felt about printing, when they said, "If we do not put that down, it will put us down." My office,

[18] *Reply*, p. 171.

[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 171, 172.

duties, labors, stand in their way. Hence my immediate destruction is for the glory of God. They have not done yet; though from circumstances, which I will proceed to name, they have just now suspended hostilities.

There are two classes,—the one who are orthodox only by association, education, or personal condition. These may be good people, though they always suffer under that limitation of the faculties which orthodoxy imposes. The second class are those who are born orthodox, who are naturally or indigenously so; who, if they had had wit enough, would have invented orthodoxy, if Calvin had not. I never saw one of this class of men whom I could trust so long as a man can hold his breath. These are the men who are assailing me.

My Report caused a great stir among the Boston teachers: I mean those of the grammar-schools. The very things in the Report which made it acceptable to others made it hateful to them. The general reader was delighted with the idea of intelligent, gentlemanly teachers; of a mind-expanding education; of children governed by moral means. The leading men among the Boston grammar-school masters saw their own condemnation in this description of their European contemporaries, and resolved, as a matter of self-preservation, to keep out the infection of so fatal an example as was afforded by the Prussian schools. The better members dissuaded, remonstrated, resisted; but they are combined together, and feel that in union is their only strength. The evil spirit prevailed. A committee was appointed to consider my Report. A part of the labor fell into the worst hands. After working at the task all summer, they sent forth, on the 1st of September, a pamphlet of a hundred and forty-four pages, which I send you, and leave you to judge of its character . . .

I think the Reply is doing something in Boston. All except the ultra-orthodox papers are earnest, I may almost say vehement, against the masters. I ought to have said that one of the masters, William J. Adams, Esq., came out in the newspaper with a public retraction, and disavowal of his signature. He is the most gentlemanly & respectable man among them.[20]

In the *Rejoinder to the "Reply,"* the writer of the section dealing with school discipline now signed his name, Joseph

[20] *Life,* pp. 230-232, corrected from a copy of the letter in the "Mann Papers."

Hale.[21] In this document the writer introduced his own religious position because, as he asserted, "the subject itself, when viewed in its widest relations inclines that way."

Admitting and urging that moral incentives should be used, Hale nevertheless maintained the "naked doctrine" that corporal punishment was in certain cases necessary, natural, and proper. Sympathy, "the predominant feature of the age," had reached an abnormal ascendancy. There was much "pseudo-philanthropy" abroad, a tendency to "merge self-love into philanthropy; convert *I* into *We;* and blend the race, en masse, into one grand brotherhood of mutual love and worship, which would seem to put paradise to the blush, and to make an immortality on earth, far preferable to the worship of God in heaven." The desire to spiritualize and deify the natural man was deplored.[22] It would be a mistake to rely merely upon education. The child must give obedience to his parents and all who have the right to exercise authority over him in order to learn to submit himself unconditionally to God. For the only condition of perfect love toward God is implicit submission to His will. Holding such views, the writer said he would have no sympathy with those "who aim to raise a structure of character upon the basis of self-complacency."[23]

The real issue, therefore, according to Hale, related to human nature:

> If then all authority is of God, and must be obeyed, it becomes indispensable, in order to settle the question whether compulsion may ever be absolutely necessary or not, that we decide whether there is in the nature of man an innate element of evil, prompting him to rebellion. If there is, then compulsion results from resistance; if not, then the impulses are all that is necessary to secure duty; temptation is at an

[21] The four sections of the *Rejoinder* were separately paged, so that each constituted a pamphlet, doubtless, as Mann observed, to make it possible to send one part where it was not deemed expedient for the other parts to go. See also *Answer to the Rejoinder,* p. 4.

[22] *Rejoinder to the Fourth Section of the Reply,* p. 53. [23] *Ibid.,* p. 55.

end; virtue is a negation; vice a nonentity; repentance a work of supererogation.[24]

Here was an appeal to the religious prejudices of the Orthodox in the "Hopkinsian"[25] terms of "self-love," "selfishness," "benevolence," and "implicit submission" to God's will, which were as well understood as was the disparagement of the Unitarian belief in the inherent dignity and worth of human nature. Mr. Mann refused to be drawn into a theological controversy, although in his *Answer to the Rejoinder* he said that Hale had done an injustice by misrepresenting the belief of those whose faith he had attacked. He said, moreover, that he believed that the subject of school discipline could and ought to be discussed "without reference to private denominational views of the parties."[26] In another part of the *Answer* Mr. Mann made the following surprising statement:

> One of the Masters said, in so many words, "The Board of Education *is* abolished; we only wait for the assembling of the Legislature to record the decision." Within the "Association," doubtless there were some restraints as to means, but out of it, the most unjustifiable ones were resorted to. One of the Masters said in my hearing, and has been known to say the same thing repeatedly to others;—that the plan now was to convert this whole controversy into a *sectarian* movement against the Board, in order, by combining religious opposition with the opposition of malcontents from all other causes, to overthrow the Board of Education! This threat has been executed by some individuals, with most dishonorable fidelity.[27]

Two letters written in October, 1844, support the evidence of the sectarian character of the attack presented in the documents in the controversy. The first letter was written by Lewis G. Pray of Boston to Gideon F. Thayer[28] and was dated October 2. One paragraph of the letter reads as follows:

[24] *Rejoinder*, p. 57. [25] See pp. 4 ff.
[26] *Answer to the Rejoinder*, pp. 108, 109. [27] *Ibid.*, p. 16.
[28] Mr. Thayer was the founder, and at this time, and until 1855, was master and owner of the Chauncy Hall School.—Barnard: *American Educational Biography*, pp. 218-226.

Since I saw you, I have read *the* Pamphlet. I think it was uncalled for—I deprecate, and regret the spirit which pervades a part of it; and sympathize with Mr. M. under the repeated attacks to which he has been subjected for doing a noble work in the cause of Education in a noble way. The pamphlet is obviously open to a severe reply, and as Mr. M. wields a forceful and caustic pen I should think some of the writers would regret they ever "enlisted." I am persuaded that the spirit at the bottom of the whole is Sectarianism, with pecuniary interest as a ready and subtle auxiliary.

The second letter was from Rev. Samuel J. May, the Unitarian minister who had recently completed two years as principal of the Lexington Normal School during the absence of "Father" Peirce. The letter was dated October 10, 1844:

Orthodoxy is at the bottom of the hostility, which is now manifesting itself, to the Hon. Secretary and his plans of improvement. I need not tell you that its spirit is bitter and implacable. Your notions respecting the true method of managing the young children of Adam, are in direct conflict with the cherished, the fundamental doctrines of the orthodox respecting the imps of fallen man. They cannot admit the principle, you advocate, into the government of children, without conceding that there is more of the angelic than of the devilish in them; and rather than admit what they have so long, so stoutly denied, they would see the Hon. Secretary and the Board, and Normal Schools annihilated,—and subject the youth of our country to more of that treatment, which is adapted to make fiends of them and would make them so, if the good principle in human nature were not stronger than the evil.

From the evidence which has been presented, it will be seen that the attack of the Boston schoolmasters was due to something more than wounded vanity and jealousy occasioned by the *Seventh Report*. Nor is the controversy fully explained as being the result of the conservatism and inertia which were opposed to progressive measures. It is undoubtedly true that all of these motives, and probably others of a personal nature, were enlisted in the campaign. But the testimony of the documents in the controversy, the letters of Mann to Combe, and the letters of Pray

and May, point to religious prejudice on the part of some individuals engaged in the attack.

Just how general this opposition of the Orthodox was in 1844 cannot be definitely determined. It does not appear to have been widespread. Over against Mann's statement, in his letter of July 30 to Combe, that an "extensive conspiracy" had been formed, must be placed his other statements that it was the "ultra-orthodox" who were behind the conspiracy and that the "best portion of the orthodox" were supporting the Board and himself.

To these considerations which point to the conclusion that the movement was comparatively isolated, instigated and carried through by a small group of individuals, must be added the testimony of two additional letters and a newspaper article. These reveal the hand of one who had not forgotten the thwarting of his plans six years before. The first letter was written to Mann on July 16, 1844, six weeks before the Schoolmasters' *Remarks* appeared. It was from George B. Emerson. We quote the following extract:

> I shall regret, as much as you can, the appearance of a hostile spirit among the common school teachers. But if it must come, let it come. You will be able, with your forbearance, to give such a turn to their arguments whatever they may be, that the absurdity of their position shall be made apparent, and good come out of the movement.
>
> As to the Packard storm, you need have no serious apprehensions. I am sure that the cause of his opposition may be easily made apparent. He has always set himself against the progress of light. I verily believe that it is better for such persons to come out and be seen and answered than for their action to be kept concealed.

The second letter, from which we quote, was written by Mann to his friend, Samuel G. Howe, on October 8:

> The Cossacks thicken upon flank & rear. Have you seen Brownson's notice of the "Remarks," in which he flings the javelin across my frontier?[29]

[29] In a brief notice of the *Remarks*, in his *Brownson's Quarterly Review*, I, 547, O. A. Brownson said: "Mr. Mann knows nothing of the philosophy of education, for he knows nothing of Christian morals and theology."

Also the Rev. Mr. Phelps in the Mercantile Journal of Saturday evening. I heard during the summer that that scoundrel, Fred A. Packard had been inflaming him with prejudices on the religious side of this question, & from this article in the Mercantile, I should think him to be a congenial spirit with Fred, or with both Freds.[30]

The article in the *Mercantile Journal* was a communication from Rev. A. A. Phelps, a member of the Boston Primary School Committee. It appeared in the issue of October 5, 1844. The writer stated that although he did not know Mr. Mann personally, he considered his theories to be *"false in philosophy, false in morals, and false in religion."* He called upon Mann to publish the correspondence which had passed between himself and Packard:

I would also particularly ask Mr. Mann, if he will call for, or consent to, the publication of a correspondence on the general subject, that passed, some years since, between himself, as Secretary of the Massachusetts Board, and Mr. Frederick A. Packard, Recording Secretary of the American Sabbath [*sic*] School Union, at Philadelphia. I have not seen the correspondence, but from such information as I have respecting the whole case, I have reason to believe that Mr. Packard would be quite willing, on his part, for its publication. I think also, without intimating of what sort it is, that the correspondence contains some things which it belongs properly to the Christian public to know. Will Mr. Mann call for, or consent to and authorize, so far as he is concerned, the publication of that correspondence?

Mr. Mann made no direct reply to this attempt to revive the old fight over the Library. But there was, nevertheless, a very definite answer in his *Reply to the Remarks*, in which, as we have seen, he referred to the Packard episode in a footnote, and then declared that so long as he held the office of Secretary his duties would be administered with impartiality and justice toward all.

If Packard continued his attempts to place obstacles in the

[30] The second "Fred" was doubtless Frederick Emerson.

way of progress, there was another, who had been an enemy, who appears to have experienced a change of heart. This was Dodge of Hamilton, who led the fights in the House of Representatives in 1840 and 1841, and whose report of the majority of the Committee on Education in 1840 had been quoted by Newton and the *Christian Witness* in the recent controversy. In view of the zeal with which Dodge had waged the battles against the Board and Mr. Mann, and in view also of the fact that his friend, Rev. S. P. Parker, had considered his prejudices too deep-seated to be removed by any evidence, the following extract from a letter written by Horace Mann to Mrs. Mann on January 16, 1845, is interesting:

> Went down to the depot and there met Dodge, of anti-Board of Education memory. He was very gracious, talked about my Reports, & my "excoriating" the Boston teachers, as tho' I had been one of his old favorites. Let him talk, that is worth nothing, but is a sort of promise that he won't come out & attack it again as he has done before. He thought I was quite right,—or at least, said he thought so, in the Newton controversy, &c. &c.

Dodge had been state senator from the Essex district in 1844, and it is possible that his failure to be returned in 1845 had caused him to take a more open-minded attitude toward the cause which had successfully met with opposition. There is no evidence to show that political ambition was the reason for his show of friendliness to Mann, however; it is more charitable, and probably much nearer the truth, to believe that the evidence brought forward from many sources had convinced him that the Board and the Secretary had no "designs" against the faith of the Orthodox, and that they were pursuing the only course possible under the existing laws, in a state where there was such a diversity of religious beliefs. Certainly he had seen enough to warrant such a conclusion during the debates in the legislature. The further evidence submitted by Mann in the controversies

with Newton and the Boston schoolmasters, with the added testimony of men of the Orthodox faith which had appeared in the newspapers had undoubtedly helped to remove the prejudice which had been created in his mind during the early days of Packard's attack.

In January, 1845, a splendid tribute to Mr. Mann's leadership and achievements was made by a group of his friends which must have brought new courage in the midst of the fight he was waging. Thirty-four leading citizens in Boston signed a letter to Mann in which they acknowledged their debt to him for the great work he was doing. The copy which appears in Appendix C, p. 287, bears the names of Longfellow, Sumner, Josiah Quincy, Jr., Dr. Howe, and many other well-known men. The letter was accompanied by an offer to subscribe five thousand dollars toward the expense of erecting permanent buildings for the normal schools at Westfield and Bridgewater on condition that the legislature would appropriate a like sum.[31]

Charles Sumner took the lead in raising the subscription, and was chairman of the committee which presented the memorial to the legislature. The offer was accepted, and the appropriation was passed March 20, 1845.[32] His biographer says that Sumner gave his personal note for the five thousand dollars before all was raised, and later suffered embarrassment through failure of some to meet their obligations.[33]

The subject of the Bible in the schools had been frequently mentioned in connection with the controversies during the year 1844. Mann had expressed his own earnest conviction that the Bible should be used, and had asserted that the practice had increased during his term of office. In his *Eighth Report,* dated

[31] The original together with letters written by Horace Mann and Mrs. Mann in acknowledgment of this tribute are in the "Mann Papers."

[32] *Senate Document* 1845, No. 24; *House Document* 1845, No. 17; *Resolves of Mass.,* 1845, Chap. 100, p. 623.

[33] Edward L. Pierce: *Memoir and Letters of Charles Sumner,* in 4 volumes, II, 325-329.

December 10, 1844, he stated that the inquiry had been renewed during the past summer, and that he had taken measures to learn just how extensively the Bible was now being used. He reminded his readers that he had stated in an early Report that the Bible was then in almost all of the schools.[34] The results of his study now revealed that of the three hundred and eight towns of the State, the Bible was prescribed as a reading book by the school committees of two hundred and fifty-eight towns. It was used in thirty-eight other towns either as a devotional or a reading book. In three towns the Bible was not generally read, and nine towns had not replied to Mann's letter of inquiry.[35]

Mr. Mann did not give any figures in his *Second Report* with which these may be compared. But fortunately an article in the *American Annals of Education and Instruction* for March, 1837, gives some statistics derived from the School returns for 1837, which were required by the School Fund Law of 1834 to be forwarded to the Secretary of State. As this article was written in March, 1837, three months before Mr. Mann entered the work of the Secretaryship, a comparison of these figures with those in the *Eighth Report* is interesting. Of the three hundred and five towns in the State, two hundred and eighty-nine made returns, and of these only one hundred and four stated that the Bible was used in the schools.

The *Boston Recorder,* in the issue of March 3, 1837, had commented upon the "startling facts" revealed in these returns, and had called the attention of the public to them. In the issue of March 17, 1837, a writer who signed himself "Q" said that he had supposed that the Bible was generally used, and that the statement so often heard that the Bible was going out of the schools was not true. Another communication appeared in the issue of March 31, in which the writer, "R," a member of a school committee, stated that he had assumed that the Bible was

[34] *Second Report,* p. 78.

[35] *Eighth Report,* p. 75.

universally used in the schools, and so had neglected to mention it in the list of schoolbooks. He hoped that this was true of all the other schools that did not include it.

But although exact statistics for the earlier years are lacking, it is evident that so far from crowding the Bible out of the schools, the influence of Mann and the Board had been to increase its use.

In commenting upon the figures reported by Mr. Mann, the Board in their Report added that the Bible had been in all of the normal schools from the beginning, and that it was believed that it was used in like manner in all of the academies in the State. In the closing pages, the Board made a strong plea for the Bible, and for religious instruction in all of the schools. The provisions of the law were cited, and the committees were reminded that jealousies would result from sectarian instruction, or from the introduction of sectarian books; but the Bible was regarded as unsectarian, and its use was urged. The Board believed that public opinion would guard against any wrong interpretation or abuse. Recognizing the value of the church, the Sunday school, and the home as agents of religious education, they nevertheless said that thousands of children would receive no instruction in religion unless they received it in the common schools. The Board proposed no legislation; they said the question was beyond legislation, and rested upon public opinion. But they reminded the community of the blessings in moral power and character which resulted from the "institutions of the Pilgrims," and urged that the teaching of religion should not be neglected.[36]

These statements in the *Eighth Report* were made by a Board a majority of whom were Orthodox; but they were made at the urgent suggestion of Mr. Mann. Four years later, in his *Twelfth Report,* in a review of the course he had followed during his twelve years as Secretary, he wrote that when the charges were

[36] *Eighth Report,* pp. 15-18.

first made that he and the Board were hostile to religion and the Scriptures, he urged the Board to make a public and explicit denial of them. The Board, however, knowing that the charges were groundless, and believing they would be temporary, deemed it best not to give to them the undeserved importance which would result from a formal reply. The error had continued in the public mind, and for years he had suffered from misconstructions of his conduct and imputations of his motives. In this *Eighth Report* of the Board he had fully concurred, and he said that after its publication he had always referred to it as explaining the views of the Board and as an interpretation of the law of the State. He continued:

> Officially and unofficially, publicly and privately, in theory and in practice, my course has always been in conformity with its doctrines. And I avail myself of this, the last opportunity which I may ever have, to say, in regard to all affirmations or intimations, that I have ever attempted to exclude religious instruction from school, or to exclude the Bible from school, or to impair the force of that volume, arising out of itself, that they are now, and always have been, without substance or semblance of truth.[37]

III. *The Controversy with Matthew Hale Smith.*

In 1846, Mr. Mann became engaged in another controversy. The sensational manner in which the charges were made in this instance gave to them an emphasis in the public mind out of all proportion to the importance of the individual by whom they were preferred.

On October 10, 1846, Rev. Matthew Hale Smith preached a sermon in the Church of the Pilgrims in Boston, in which he charged that the crime and immorality which were just at that time being brought to the attention of the public because of a moral crusade were due primarily to the lack of proper religious instruction in the home and the school. The title of the

[37] *Twelfth Report*, pp. 114-116.

sermon suggests the quality of mind of the preacher: "The Ark of God on a New Cart."[38] Smith took as his text the words in *II Samuel* 6: 3, "And they set the ark of God on a new cart." Although the exegesis is somewhat labored, it appears that Smith would liken the schools for the education of youth to the ark of God. In former times the ark had been carried on the shoulders of God's appointed priests, but Uzzah placed it upon a new cart drawn by oxen. In the days of the Puritans the children had been taught the doctrines of Calvin, but all this had been given up for the non-sectarian ethics of the new scheme of education under the direction of the Board of Education and its Secretary. Just as Uzzah of old had been stricken with death when he touched the ark in violation of God's command, so today society was being afflicted with juvenile depravity because of its departure from the means ordained of God for the training of its youth. It may be said that the analogy was forced; but it furnished a point of departure for the speaker as well as a sensation for his hearers, and so served its purpose. Smith arraigned the Board and Mann in the following language:

An effort has been made, and that too with some success, to do three things with our common schools. 1. To get out of them the Bible and all religious instruction. 2. To abolish the use of the rod, and all correction, but a little talk. 3. To make common schools a counterpoise to religious instruction at home and in Sabbath schools. The Board of Education in Massachusetts has aided in this work in two ways. 1. By allowing an individual, under the sanction of its authority, to disseminate through the land crude and destructive principles, principles believed to be at war with the Bible and with the best interests of the

[38] Smith had been a Universalist minister from 1829 until he became a convert to Calvinism and joined the First Church in New Haven in 1840. An account of his conversion is given in an autobiographical sketch in his book, *Universalism Not of God. An Examination of the System of Universalism; its Doctrine, Arguments, and Fruits, with the Experience of the Author, during a Ministry of Twelve Years,* pp. 12-55. Cyrus Peirce, in a communication which appeared in the *Boston Recorder,* issue of June 17, 1847, quotes Smith's brother as saying that he was "religiously insane; his slanders should be regarded as the fruit of a mind diseased —a spirit bereft of reason."

young for time and eternity. 2. By a library which excludes books as sectarian that inculcate truths, which *nine-tenths of professed Christians of all names believe,* while it accepts others that inculcate the most deadly heresy—even universal salvation. We ask not that religion shall be sustained by law; but we do ask that impiety and irreligion shall not be supported by the state. When religious and intellectual culture are divorced, is it strange that we have a harvest of crime?[39]

Mr. Mann answered these charges, though some of his friends believed that he made a mistake in taking any notice of Smith.[40] But as the sermon had been preached twice to large audiences, and had been printed in the *Boston Recorder,*[41] he believed it necessary to defend the Board and the cause. He pointed out in the first place, that if the Bible or moral instruction were absent from any of the schools, the absence was due to the school committees, and not to the Board who had no authority over the local schools. In the second place, he showed that the Board's policy "from the day of its organization to the present time" had been to "get the Bible *into* the common

[39] Matthew Hale Smith: *The Bible, the Rod, and Religion in Common Schools,* p. 11. This pamphlet contains the following titles: "The Ark of God on a New Cart," A Sermon, by Rev. M. Hale Smith. "Review of the Sermon," by Wm. B. Fowle, publisher of the *Mass. Common School Journal.* "Strictures on the Sectarian Character of the Common School Journal," by a Member of the Mass. Board of Education. "Correspondence between the Hon. Horace Mann, Sec. of the Board of Education, and Rev. Matthew Hale Smith."

[40] George B. Emerson wrote to Mann on January 19, 1847:

I have been trying today to find out who Matthew Hale Smith is; and scarcely any body knows. . . . Abuse is the highest compliment he knows how to pay. He evidently takes the brightest & most conspicuous mark he can find.

I am very sorry to hear that you have ever taken any notice of him. It is infinitely more than he deserves. His pamphlet I have not been able to find. It is apparently in no respectable book-store. When I can find it I shall look it over. But I hope you will never be disturbed by him again.

I believe you have not the least reason to fear any combination against you in the House or out. You never stood so well as now. And if you will be persuaded to rise above such poor creatures as Smith, and not even to read their ribaldry, you will sooner enter into your rest. To pause to notice them, much more to reply to them is time more than thrown away. You would be farther on, even with them, if you did nothing about it.

[41] *Boston Recorder,* Oct. 15, 1846.

schools instead of *out* of them."[42] The *Eighth Report,* which we have cited above, was quoted in support of this statement. The third point in Mann's defense was an explicit denial that the Board had done anything to "abolish the use of the rod" in the schools, "and all correction but a little talk." He believed they were opposed to the flagrant abuses of corporal punishment which had been prevalent; but they supported its use in cases where the failure of all higher means of discipline made it necessary. In defense of the School Library, he explained the method of unanimous approval adopted by the Board to insure a selection of non-sectarian books, and denied that any of the books taught "the most deadly heresy, even universal salvation."

Such a man as Smith could not be expected to support his side of the debate fairly, and present proof of his charges. When pressed for proof, he shifted his attack to Mann's personal beliefs regarding the Bible, corporal punishment, and human nature, and insisted that Mann was opposed to religious instruction in the schools. In a second letter, Mann denied the charge:

> Everyone who has availed himself of the means of arriving at the truth, on this point, knows that I am in favor of religious instruction in our schools, to the extremest verge to which it can be carried without invading those rights of conscience which are established by the laws of God, and guaranteed to us by the Constitution of the State.[43]

Determined to press his attack, Smith published the sermon and his correspondence with Mr. Mann, and repeated his charge that the Secretary had "ruled" religion out of the schools. To this accusation Mann replied in the following language:

> You must allow me here, Mr. Smith, to speak in decided tones. You are touching solemn matters, at least with heedlessness, if not with wickedness aforethought. You accuse me before the world, of being

[42] *The Bible, the Rod, and Religion in Common Schools,* p. 24.
[43] *Ibid.,* p. 33.

opposed to religion in our schools. I regard hostility to religion in our schools, as the greatest crime which I could commit against man or against God. Had I the power, I would sooner repeat the massacre of Herod, than I would keep back religion from the young. My own consciousness acquits me of your accusation. I call the All-searching Eye to witness that it is as false as any thing ever engendered in the heart of man or fiend.[44]

Little good could result from controversy with such a man. But it gave an opportunity to state again the position of the Board and Mann, and to show the weakness of those who would force sectarianism into the schools. This opportunity Mann embraced, in a humorous but nevertheless forceful argument, from which we quote the following paragraphs:

I leave you for a moment, Mr. Smith, in order to address a few considerations to those who think that *doctrinal* religion should be taught in our schools; and who would empower each town or school district to determine the *kind* of doctrine to be taught. It is easy to see that the experiment would not stop with having half a dozen conflicting creeds taught by authority of law, in the different schools of the same town or vicinity. Majorities will change in the same place. One sect may have the ascendancy, today; another, tomorrow. This year, there will be three Persons in the Godhead; next year, but One; and the third year, the Trinity will be restored, to hold its precarious sovereignty, until it shall be again dethroned by the worms of the dust it has made. This year, the everlasting fires of hell will burn, to terrify the impenitent; next year, and without any repentance, its eternal flames will be extinguished,—to be rekindled forever, or to be quenched forever, as it may be decided at annual town meetings. This year, under Congregational rule, the Rev. Mr. So and So, and the Rev. Dr. So and So, will be on the committee; but next year, these Reverends and Reverend Doctors will be plain Misters,—never having had apostolical consecration from the Bishop. This year, the ordinance of baptism is inefficacious without immersion; next year one drop of water will be as good as forty fathoms. Children attending the district schools will be taught one way; going from the district school to the town high school, they will be taught another way. In controversies

[44] Horace Mann: *Sequel to the So-called Correspondence between the Rev. M. H. Smith and Horace Mann,* p. 31.

involving such momentous interests, the fiercest party spirit will rage, and all the contemplations of heaven be poisoned by the passions of earth. Will not town lines and school district lines be altered, to restore an unsuccessful, or to defeat a successful party? Will not fiery zealots move from place to place, to turn the theological scale, as, it is said, is sometimes now done, to turn a political one? And will not the godless make a merchandise of religion by being bribed to do the same thing? Can aught be conceived more deplorable, more fatal to the interests of the young than this? Such strifes and persecutions on the question of total depravity, as to make all men depraved at any rate; and such contests about the nature and the number of Persons in the Godhead in heaven, as to make little children atheists upon earth.

If the question, "What theology shall be taught in school?" is to be decided by districts or towns, then all the prudential and the superintending school committees must be chosen with express reference to their faith; the creed of every candidate for teaching must be investigated; and when litigations arise,—and such a system will breed them in swarms,—an ecclesiastical tribunal,—some Star Chamber, or High Commission Court, must be created to decide them. If the Governor is to have power to appoint the Judges of this Spiritual Tribunal, he also must be chosen with reference to the appointments he will make, and so too must the Legislators who are to define their power, and to give them the Purse and the Sword of the State, to execute their authority. Call such officers by the name of Judge and Governor, or Cardinal and Pope, *the thing will be the same!* The establishment of the true faith will not stop with the schoolroom. Its grasping jurisdiction will extend over all schools, over all private faith and public worship; until at last, after all our centuries of struggle and of suffering, it will come back to the inquisition, the fagot and the rack!

Let me ask here, too, where is the consistency of those, who advocate the right of a *town* or a *district* to determine, by a majority, what theology shall be taught in the schools, but deny the same right to the *State?* Does not this inconsistency blaze out into the faces of such advocates, so as to make them *feel,* if they are too blind to *see?* This would be true, even if the State had written out the theology it would enforce. But ours has not. It has only said that no one sect shall obtain any advantage over other sects, by means of the school system, which, for purposes of self-preservation, it has established.[45]

[45] Horace Mann: *Sequel to the So-called Correspondence between the Rev. M. H. Smith and Horace Mann,* pp. 40-42.

The effect of Smith's onslaught was largely offset by the power of Mann's replies.[46] In 1847, however, probably due to Smith's influence, the Massachusetts General Association appointed a committee "to consider what ought to be done for the spiritual benefit of the younger members of our congregations." The following year this committee's report deplored the rejection from the schools of "all the fundamental peculiarities of christianity," questioned the utility of the organization of the Board of Education, and suggested that "some dangers could be avoided by abolishing the Board of Education, the Secretaryship, and the system of Normal Schools." But the committee believed that the subject had not yet been sufficiently matured, and recommended no definite course of action to the churches.[47]

In October, 1847, there appeared in the *New Englander,* an Orthodox magazine published in New Haven, an article entitled "The Common School Controversy in Massachusetts,"[48] in which the writer reviewed the whole course of the Board and Mann from the beginning of their work in 1837. The charges brought against them by Packard, Newton, and Smith were shown to be without foundation. None of these men was mentioned by name, but it was suggested that the attack of the writer of the *Four Letters to Dr. Humphrey* was due to other causes than his opposition to the Law of 1827, and that a satisfactory explanation could be given for his antagonism if it were

[46] The annoyance caused by the attack, which came just when Mann was working fifteen hours a day in getting out the *Tenth Report,* is reflected in the following extract from a letter to Mr. and Mrs. George Combe, written February 25, 1847:

"Just as I was looking for a little relief from the pressure of my labors, a child of sin and Satan came out with a ferocious orthodox attack upon the Board of Education and myself, which I felt moved to answer; and here is another pretty job of work of fifty-six pages. Now, I assure you, it would have been vastly more pleasant to have been writing to you and Mrs. Combe, . . . than to be fighting, like St. Paul, the wild beasts of Ephesus." *Life,* p. 253.

[47] *Common School Journal,* X, Extra (July 15, 1848), 1-5.

[48] The *New Englander,* V, 513-522. The Index Volume published in 1862, p. 26, attributes this article to Emerson Davis.

necessary. Packard immediately wrote a long article in vindication of himself, and requested the editor of the *New Englander* to publish it. In the issue for January, 1848, the editor, in a brief notice, acknowledged receipt of the communication, but declined to publish it, stating that it would be "inconsistent with the plan of the *New Englander* to admit a personal controversy between writers." In an effort to do full justice to Mr. Packard, the editor said:

> Had we known at first the name of the respondent, we should have been unwilling to suspect that he could be guilty of any measures, in the slightest degree dishonorable, for promoting an object, however dear and important. And now with his explanation of the facts before us, we think he has successfully exonerated himself from such an imputation. This expression of opinion, we hope will have the effect of doing him full justice, with those few persons, to whom an anonymous writer's name can be known.[49]

But while anxious to do full justice to him, the Orthodox editor recognized that Packard's course had not been above suspicion, and he added:

> At the same time, he will pardon us for saying, in justice to the author of the article, that the facts, as understood and stated by him, fully justify the view which was taken of his course.

Mr. Mann's *Eleventh Report,* which was dated December 16, 1847, and which appeared early in 1848, was largely devoted to the subject, "The Power of Common Schools to Redeem the State from Social Vices and Crimes." A circular letter had been sent to eight prominent teachers, living in the northeastern section of the United States.[50] Three questions were asked in this letter. The first inquired the number of years the teacher had taught school, and the second, the estimated number of children

[49] The *New Englander,* VI, 152.

[50] These teachers were John Griscom, D. P. Page, Solomon Adams, Rev. Jacob Abbott, F. A. Adams, E. A. Andrews, Roger S. Howard, and Miss Catherine E. Beecher.

that had been under the teacher's care. The third question was as follows:

> Should all our schools be kept by teachers of high intellectual and moral qualifications, and should all the children in the community be brought within these schools, for ten months in a year, from the age of four to that of sixteen years; then, what proportion,—what per-centage,—of such children as you have had under your care, could, in your opinion, be so educated and trained, that their existence, on going out into the world, would be a benefit and not a detriment, an honor and not a shame to society? Or, to state the question in a general form, if all children were brought within the salutary and auspicious influences I have here supposed, what per-centage of them should you pronounce to be irreclaimable and hopeless?[51]

The replies from these teachers, which were printed in the *Report,* showed that they believed that under the conditions named, almost all children would become useful members of society. Two teachers believed there would be no failures.

In reporting the replies given by these teachers, Mann stated that each of the eight were well-known believers in the theological creed, one of the fundamental articles of which was the depravity of human nature.[52] He had addressed only those who believed in this doctrine, because, as he said, if they believed that the common school system, under the right conditions, could train a generation of men who would "practice towards their fellow-men whatsoever things are true, honest, just, pure, lovely, and of good report," then all of the community could work together to accomplish that ideal. Christian men of all faiths could unite in the reform.

Mann then urged the necessity of meeting such conditions as he had mentioned in the circular letter. He called attention to

[51] *Eleventh Report,* p. 56.

[52] Mann's statement of Orthodox tenets brought several protests including one from S. W. S. Dutton, editor of the *New Englander,* who wrote that the Orthodox of New Haven had been fighting for twenty years against the kind of Orthodoxy described by Mann.

the need for better teachers, who would make teaching their profession. He pleaded for adequate compensation and social recognition for them. He called for greater care on the part of school committees in the selection of teachers. He urged upon the legislature the need for measures to lengthen the school year to ten months, and to make attendance compulsory for all children from four to sixteen years of age. Education must be universal, he said; for none must be left to poison those who were trained in the schools.

In the closing pages of the *Report,* Mr. Mann confessed his high faith in the power of "Universal Education," under teachers of high moral and intellectual attainments, to train a generation "to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God." I quote his closing sentences:

> And however a portion of my fellow-mortals, or I myself, may feel, in regard to the highest religious concernments of the soul, I trust there are none, who believe that such an education as is here contemplated would be an obstacle, and not an aid, to the reception of divine truth. I trust there are none who would not readily adopt the language of Mr. Page, in his letter above cited, where he says, "I am fully of the opinion that *the right of expectation of a religious character* would be increased very much in proportion to the excellence of the training given, since God never ordains means which he does not intend to bless."[53]

IV. *Mr. Mann's Resignation.*

On February 23, 1848, John Quincy Adams died in the United States House of Representatives. Horace Mann was chosen as his successor. Although at first Mr. Mann refused to accept the nomination, he finally yielded to the urging of his friends.[54] He was elected in April, and resigned his office as Secretary of the

[53] *Eleventh Report,* p. 135.

[54] Several letters written to Mann at this time by S. G. Howe are in the *Letters and Journals of Samuel Gridley Howe,* pp. 256-259.

Board of Education.[55] Several letters written by him help to explain his reasons for leaving the position which he had so ably filled, and show that he was certain that the cause of education was now so well established in Massachusetts that there was no danger that it could be destroyed. The first letter from which we quote was written to William B. Fowle of Boston, who was Mann's printer, and one of the staunch supporters of the educational movement. It was written on April 17, 1848, shortly after Mr. Mann arrived in Washington:

I arrived here in about thirty-four hours after the cars left Boston; but found myself quite in a state of collapse, as soon as I had time to be conscious of my consciousness. I have felt very miserable about this whole change. The Common school cause, in Massachusetts, was so consolidated,—as the French say about their republicanism,—that I felt sure nothing could overturn it. It was only annoyances and obstructions that we had to look after, & these had dwindled away until they had fallen into the hands of some of the meanest spirits with which God suffers the earth to be afflicted. But here all is new; & I risk my fortunes on an untried & hazardous voyage. But the die is cast, and I must bide the result, let its face come up which ever way it may.

There is unmistakable evidence that Mann now welcomed this opportunity to retire from a situation in which he had long faced opposition. In a letter to Mrs. Mann written from Washington, and dated May 16, 1848, he mentions the recent appointment of another man to the Board of Education and says:

I think I am lucky in having a chance to retire; for I doubt very much whether I could have administered the Secretaryship under him. He is a man in whose moral character I have no faith; & the chance is that I should get into a quarrel with him before long.

Another letter written to his friend George Combe of Scot-

[55] A copy of Mann's letter of resignation written to Governor Briggs is in the Minutes of the Board for June 1, 1848. On September 12, Rev. Barnas Sears, President of the Newton Theological Institution, a Baptist seminary, was elected as Mann's successor.

land, and dated April 12, 1849, indicates that the condition of his health was a large factor to be taken into consideration in making his decision:

> Can I justify myself to you for having laid down an educational office, and taken up a political one? I can truly say, that, on my part, the change was an involuntary one. After the nomination was made, I prepared an answer, peremptorily declining it. But various collateral incidents and accidental causes led a council of my best friends to decide that I should reverse my purpose. Among other considerations, I think a regard for my health was the most decisive; and, if my health or life were worth any thing, they were right. I now verily believe that another year, without aid and without relaxation, would have closed my labors upon earth.[56]

On November 15, 1850, he wrote to Mr. and Mrs. Combe:

> When first offered the nomination for Congress, I had serious doubts about accepting it: but I was in my twelfth year as Secretary of the Board of Education; and, while acting in an official capacity, I was under the trammels of neutrality between all sects and parties. It was just at the crisis when the destiny of our new Territory of about six hundred thousand square miles in extent was about to be determined. All of human history that I ever knew respecting the contest for political and religious freedom, and my own twelve-years' struggle to imbue the public mind with an understanding not merely of the law but of the spirit of religious liberty, had so magnified in my mind the importance of free institutions, and so intensified my horror of all forms of slavery, that even the importance of education itself seemed for a moment to be eclipsed.
>
> Besides, my fidelity to principles had made some enemies, who, to thwart me, would resist progress, but who, if I were out of the way, would be disarmed, and would co-operate where they had combated.[57]

In his own words, Horace Mann thus gave the reasons for his resignation. His health was in jeopardy. The severe strain to which he had been subjected for years, while meeting the

[56] *Life*, p. 277.

[57] *Ibid.*, p. 336.

attacks of those who would destroy the cause in which he was engaged, had brought him to the point where relief was imperative. Moreover, he longed to speak out his convictions on slavery. For eleven years he had considered himself bound to keep silent on the great questions upon which good people differed. But now he was certain that the cause of education was secure against its enemies. Occasional references subsequent to his resignation, and in succeeding years, were to show how bitter was the enmity which a few bore toward him; their perusal here would add nothing to our knowledge of his achievements. Horace Mann had won. The cause was so well established in the public esteem that his going would only remove the handicap of personal opposition against himself which had been created during the fight.

CHAPTER XII

Conclusion

OUR study of Horace Mann's relation to the teaching of religion in the schools of Massachusetts has revealed several facts which help to answer the questions raised in the Introduction. It remains for us in this closing chapter to summarize and interpret these facts.

In the first place, it is clear that the teaching of sectarian religious doctrines had to a considerable extent, but not generally, disappeared from the public schools before Mr. Mann began his work as Secretary of the Board of Education in 1837.

There is evidence that, in some places, sectarian teaching still prevailed. In the *Twelfth Report,* Mr. Mann says that during his first educational tour of the state in 1837, he found doctrinal books and doctrinal instruction in the schools.

But if there were cases where sectarian instruction existed in the schools, it is certain that in a considerable portion of the community it had largely disappeared before 1837. During his controversy with Newton and the *Christian Witness,* Mann stated that the Assembly's Catechism and the teaching of Orthodox doctrines had largely, but not entirely, disappeared from the schools in the nine eastern counties of the state, which contained more than five-eighths of the population, long before the Law of 1837 creating the Board of Education was passed. In the *Fourth Report* he said that among all of the school committees' reports for the year, not one had advocated sectarian instruction or the use of sectarian schoolbooks.[1] Moreover, of more than a thousand of the reports which he had received from the school committees, the whole trend, with two exceptions, was

[1] *Fourth Report,* p. 59.

opposed to sectarianism in the schools. He also stated that the evidence from the opinions expressed in all of the common school conventions which he had attended bore in the same direction. In nearly all of these conventions the subject of moral and religious instruction had been discussed, and on only one occasion had sectarian instruction been advocated, and that was immediately opposed by an Orthodox clergyman.

In addition to the evidence presented by Mr. Mann, we have the testimony of Samuel M. Burnside that the Law of 1827, which forbade the introduction of sectarian schoolbooks, represented the practice existing at the time of its enactment. Mr. Burnside expressly contradicted Newton's statement that sectarian doctrines were taught in the schools until 1837, when the Board of Education and the Secretaryship were created. He said that the Committee on Education in 1827 did not understand that theological doctrines had been taught in the schools for many years, though he added, "certainly not, where they were objected to." It is apparent that Mr. Burnside was mistaken; for his statement is contradicted by Mann in the *Twelfth Report* which we have cited above. But the fact that the man who framed the Law of 1827 believed that sectarian instruction had disappeared from the schools at the time of the passage of the law, is evidence that the practice had, in fact, been discontinued to a marked degree.

In the second place, our study has shown that the Law of 1827, which forbade the introduction of sectarian books into the schools, expressed the agreement of folk of differing religious convictions, in a common desire to protect the schools from the controversies which had divided the churches.

The law was passed seven years after the Dedham decision had been rendered by the Supreme Court. The Unitarian controversy was still going on. Parishes were voting to call Unitarian ministers to fill pulpits which had always been occupied by men of the Orthodox faith. Orthodox church members were with-

drawing to found new churches where the ancient faith could be preached without secular interference. The Law of 1826, which created a central school committee in every town, directed that the schoolbooks for all of the schools in the town should be chosen by the central committee. When this law was being revised the following year, the Committee on Education, the majority of whom Mr. Burnside believed were Orthodox, decided to insert the provision against the introduction of books calculated to favor any particular sect of Christians. This provision was regarded as a precaution to protect the schools, and was passed by a very large majority as an expression of that determination on the part of all sects.

We have seen that in the *First Report* Mr. Mann called attention to the terms of the law, and explained its meaning, while deploring the lack of moral and religious instruction in the schools. In the *Twelfth Report,* he says that when, in 1837, he found infractions of the law, though he does not state the character of the doctrines taught, nor the sect favored, he believed that if they were continued they would result in the overthrow of the schools. He also believed that if he were to discharge the duty which the law enjoined upon him, he must call attention to the law and its meaning; this he did in a general statement which he thought would not offend the transgressors. He was convinced that when the law and the principles upon which it was founded should be more fully known, the violations would cease. Every word of his Reports relating to the subject was read to the Board of Education, and none took exception to them, either as conflicting with the law, or as having "any sinister or objectionable tendency."[2]

It is worth noting that the Law of 1827 was passed because of differences between Protestant denominations in a state almost entirely Protestant in population.[3] Twenty-one years later,

[2] *Twelfth Report,* pp. 113, 114.

[3] In 1830, there were 7,000 Catholics in Boston, about 100 each in Taunton

however, in the *Twelfth Report,* Mann pointed out that of the 10,162 children in the Boston primary schools, 5,154 were children of foreign parentage, and stated that if sectarian teaching were introduced into the schools, a vast proportion of these children of foreign parentage would be immediately withdrawn. The influx of Irish Catholic immigrants during the intervening years had wrought a change, especially in the industrial centers. In the years subsequent to 1848 the Catholic threat to the public schools, the clamor for the exclusion of the Bible, and the demand that school funds be allotted to Catholics for parochial schools had the effect of rallying disaffected Protestants to the support of the public school system. Proposals made by some Protestants to establish parochial schools were wisely abandoned.[4]

The third fact that claims our attention is that a definite animus lay behind the attacks of those who would introduce sectarian instruction into the schools. Frederick A. Packard, the editor of publications of the American Sunday School Union, made every effort to secure from the Board of Education and Mr. Mann a recommendation for the highly sectarian "Select Library" prepared by the Union. Failing in this, Packard began a campaign to prejudice the Orthodox people of Massachusetts against the Board and Mann. He publicly attacked them at the Massachusetts General Association meeting at New Bedford, where he offered to read from Mann's personal correspondence to sustain his charges, and then requested that his action be kept secret. He carried on his campaign for many years by means of anonymous newspaper and magazine articles, one series of

and Fall River, a larger number in Charlestown, and small societies in Salem, Lowell, and New Bedford. The estimated Catholic population of Boston in 1845 was 30,000. See also *Quarterly Register and Journal,* May, 1830, p. 220, Article: "Historical and Statistical View of Catholics in the United States," and *Report to the Committee of the City Council, Census of Boston, 1845,* pp. 123-125.

[4] The Presbyterian General Assembly (Old School) led in this movement. See *The New Englander,* April, 1848, pp. 230-249; *New England Puritan,* November 19, 1846; July 1, 1847.

which, the *Four Letters to Dr. Humphrey,* was published in pamphlet form, and afterward reviewed by himself, anonymously, in the *Princeton Review*. There is reason to believe that he influenced Newton to resign from the Board in 1838, and it is likely—although no direct evidence has been found to confirm the suspicion—that he aided Newton in his attack on the Board and Mann in 1844. There is no proof that he had any part in the opposition of the Boston Schoolmasters, although it is certain that during the summer of 1844, he was in communication with Rev. A. A. Phelps who made an attack in October, in which he called upon Mann to publish the Packard-Mann correspondence. Packard's activity with Phelps came just at the time when the Schoolmasters were preparing their *Remarks,* and we have seen that at least in the case of some of the men involved, this attack was inspired by Orthodox views which came boldly into the open in the *Rejoinder.*

It should be said at this point, that Packard's enmity did not cease with the death of Horace Mann, which occurred at Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio, on August 2, 1859. Seven years later he published in the *Princeton Review* an anonymous review of the *Life of Horace Mann,* by his Wife, in which by omissions of important facts, and by undue emphasis on others, he interpreted Mann's work in Massachusetts as a crusade against the Orthodox. He failed to mention the Law of 1827, but made it appear that Calvinism had been generally taught in the schools until Mann and the Board sought to "liberalize" the system of instruction. Near the close of the review he said:

> We lay aside the volume with a mingled feeling of sorrow and surprise—sorrow that one capable of exerting so powerful an influence upon the interests of popular education, should have been led so far astray respecting its essential principles and ends—and with surprise, that the advocate and propagator of such radical errors in philosophy and religion should have received such unusual posthumous honours in Old Bay State.[5]

[5] *Princeton Review,* XXXVIII, 94.

It is not to be doubted that there were some men opposed to the Board and Mr. Mann who were conscientious in believing that the Orthodox doctrines of religion should be taught in the schools. Dr. Richard S. Storrs belonged to this group which appears to have been a small one. His letter in reply to Mr. Mann bears the marks of sincerity and conviction. He believed God would not bless any system of schools in which evangelical doctrines were not taught.

There was a larger class whose motives were not unmixed. In some of these, religious prejudice combined with political zeal. In others the enthusiasm for sectarianism was united with financial or other personal motives. In the case of the Boston Schoolmasters it is apparent that jealousy and wounded pride played a large part in furnishing motives for the attack. With the sensational preacher, Matthew Hale Smith, religious antagonism seems to have been reënforced by a desire for publicity, of which he succeeded in securing a generous amount before the controversy was ended.

But after taking into consideration all other factors, it is clear that a religious prejudice was created against the Board and Mann during the first and second years of their work, and that this prejudice spread, and was kept alive throughout the twelve years of Horace Mann's term of office. Back of the prejudice, back of the suspicion, back of the fear that undoubtedly filled the hearts of many honest people among the Orthodox, was the animus of a determined man who found his plans to introduce a sectarian library into the schools of Massachusetts thwarted by a Board of Education and their Secretary who believed that the law should be obeyed.

During Mr. Mann's controversy with Smith he received a letter from Rev. Emerson Davis, minister of the Congregational church in Westfield. The following is an extract:

Westfield, April 16, 1847. Hon. H. Mann, Sir, I have been reading Mr. Smith's "Correspondence" & your reply, & am surprised that

he, or any one else should designate Duncan's philosophy of the Seasons as a book containing heresy. I was a member of the Board at the time that work was published, &, after a careful examination of it, most cheerfully gave my sanction to it; & I may add, I was glad of an opportunity to recommend a book to the children of this Commonwealth that contains so much instruction & so much sound morality—I thought some of the other denominations might complain, but never dreamed that my own denomination could find any fault with its contents—I embrace substantially the sentiments of John Calvin & yet I have not found any thing in the book to which I object. . . .

There was a prejudice created against the Board of Education & yourself in the minds of many orthodox persons during the first year of the existence of the Board—You know well the manner in which it was done—If I had not happened to have stood at that time in a position, where I saw one or two individuals pull the wires that produced this result, I cannot say, but the same cloud of prejudice might have settled down upon my own mind—The plan succeeded admirably, just as its projectors would have it. It is as difficult to remove a prejudice as it is to eradicate a vice,—but I believe the day will come, when the orthodox community will be convinced, that neither the Board nor yourself have ever had any secret purpose, or desire to convert the people to any particular system of faith—or to undermine the faith of the orthodox. You know full well that such a thing cannot be done in this republican country & age—& that the attempt to do it would be your overthrow.

. . . Our ancestors judged wisely, when they said we must have schools supported by towns & open for the admission of every child. Let us sustain such schools, & while we teach, at the public expense, all the children the elements of knowledge, order, and morality, we will leave their instruction in religious doctrine, where I suppose our laws leave it, & where I believe you are disposed to leave it, to parents & religious societies—I will only add in conclusion my belief that if any evils exist in any schools in the Commonwealth in regard to government or religious instruction, they have grown out of the unreasonable opposition of others, rather than out of any specific acts of yours. I am sure there are many men in this Commonwealth, whom I esteem highly, who will say I am prejudiced & blinded—I have often asked for the proof that my views are wrong, for the

facts that confirm the *opinions* that this educational movement is an anti-religious movement—I can get no answer, except a re-affirmation of the sentiment. I have made up my mind fully, that when the history of these times shall be written, that I would rather be enrolled among the friends of the cause than among its opposers. Yours respectfully Emerson Davis.

In the fourth place, Horace Mann had a definite anti-Orthodox complex. It has been apparent from his references to "Calvinism," and "the Orthodox," which have been cited from his personal letters and from the privacy of his Journal, that Mr. Mann's attitude toward the old theology was one of opposition. This attitude may be traced directly to his boyhood religious experience under the preaching of Dr. Nathanael Emmons, the eminent "Hopkinsian" theologian, who for fifty-four years was minister of the Congregational church in Franklin, Massachusetts, the birthplace and boyhood home of Horace Mann. In a letter written to a friend during the active years of his life, Mann said that his childhood was not a happy one, and that the chief cause for his unhappiness was the blighting effect of the theology he heard expounded. He said that Emmons "not only preached to his people, but ruled them for over fifty years." Mann described him in the following language:

He was an extra or hyper-Calvinist,—a man of pure intellect, whose logic was never softened in its severity by the infusion of any kindliness of sentiment. He expounded all the doctrines of total depravity, election, and reprobation, and not only the eternity, but the extremity of hell-torments, unflinchingly and in their most terrible significance.

Mann's family always attended church as a sort of "religious ordinance," and in the letter from which we have quoted, he said that by the time he was ten years old he was familiar with the whole creed, and "knew all the arts of theological fence by which objections to it were wont to be parried."

It will be remembered that Emmons was a "Consistent Cal-

vinist," and held the "Hopkinsian" doctrine that a certain number of souls must be "lost" in order that God's sovereign government should be upheld and sin punished. The effect of these stern teachings upon the boy's sensitive nature is seen in Mann's account of his emotions:

It might be that I accepted the doctrines too literally, or did not temper them with the proper qualifications; but, in the way in which they came to my youthful mind, a certain number of souls were to be forever lost, and nothing—not powers, nor principalities, nor man, nor angel, nor Christ, nor the Holy Spirit, nay, not God himself—could save them; for he had sworn, before time was, to get eternal glory out of their eternal torment. But perhaps I might not be one of the lost! But my little sister might be, my mother might be, or others whom I loved; and I felt that, if they were in hell, it would make a hell of whatever other part of the universe I might inhabit; for I could never get a glimpse of consolation from the idea that my own nature could be so transformed, and become so like what God's was said to be, that I could rejoice in their sufferings.

Like all children, I believed what I was taught. To my vivid imagination, a physical hell was a living reality, as much so as though I could have heard the shrieks of the tormented, or stretched out my hand to grasp their burning souls, in a vain endeavor for their rescue. Such a faith spread a pall of blackness over the whole heavens, shutting out every beautiful and glorious thing; while beyond that curtain of darkness I could see the bottomless and seething lake filled with torments, and hear the wailing and agony of its victims. . . . Had there been any possibility of escape, could penance, fasting, self-inflicted wounds, or the pains of a thousand martyr-deaths, have averted the fate, my agony of apprehension would have been alleviated; but there, beyond effort, beyond virtue, beyond hope, was this irreversible decree of Jehovah, immutable, from everlasting to everlasting. . . . The consequences upon my mind and happiness were disastrous in the extreme. Often, on going to bed at night, did the objects of the day and the faces of friends give place to a vision of the awful throne, the inexorable judge, and the hapless myriads, among whom I often seemed to see those whom I loved best; and there I wept and sobbed until Nature found that counterfeit repose in exhaustion whose genuine reality she should

have found in freedom from care and the spontaneous happiness of childhood.[6]

A turning point in his life came at the age of twelve, which in itself should be of interest to students of the psychology of conversion; but it is highly significant because of its later bearing on Mann's emotional attitude toward Calvinism. He wrote that he remembered "the day, the hour, and place, the circumstances" when, "in an agony of despair," he broke the spell that bound him. A second letter in the *Life,* which evidently was written to Mrs. Mann by a friend who had known Mr. Mann after the death of his first wife,[7] explains the nature of the crisis. A great sorrow had come in the death of his beloved

[6] *Life,* pp. 13-15. Confirmation of the accuracy of Mann's description may be found in Emmons' sermon on "Reprobation." I quote from the conclusion: "If God is to be justified in his treatment of Pharaoh and of all the rest of the non-elect, then it is absolutely necessary to approve of the doctrine of reprobation in order to be saved. None can be admitted to heaven who are not prepared to join in the employments as well as enjoyments of the heavenly world. And we know that one part of the business of the blessed is to celebrate the doctrine of reprobation. They sing the song of Moses and the Lamb, which is an anthem of praise for the destruction of Pharaoh and his reprobate host. How then can any be meet for an inheritance among the saints in light, who are not reconciled to the doctrine of reprobation, which is, and which will be for ever, celebrated there?

"While the decree of reprobation is eternally executing on the vessels of wrath, the smoke of their torments will be eternally ascending in the view of the vessels of mercy, who instead of taking the part of those miserable objects, will say, 'Amen, Alleluia, praise ye the Lord.' It concerns, therefore, all the expectants of heaven to anticipate this trying scene, and ask their hearts whether they are on the Lord's side, and can praise him for reprobating as well as electing love. This is the most proper subject by which to try their christian character. They must sooner or later be brought to this touchstone, and either stand or fall by it. The day of decision is at hand. The scenes of eternity will soon open to view. And those who cannot heartily and joyfully sing the song of Moses and the Lamb, must be excluded from the abodes of the blessed, and sink speechless into the bottomless pit of despair." *The Works of Nathanael Emmons, D.D., late Pastor of the Church in Franklin, Mass. With a Memoir of his Life.* Edited by Jacob Ide, D.D., IV, 336.

[7] *Life,* pp. 16-18. The date of this letter is obviously late. The writer, whose name is not given, states that he did not know Mr. Mann until after his first wife's death when "all the gloom of his childhood returned upon him with terrible power." It was in conversations with the writer of this letter, during these dark days, that Mr. Mann related the details of his early life.

brother, who was drowned, not having experienced the Orthodox form of conversion. At the funeral, when Dr. Emmons, instead of bringing comfort and consolation to the family, addressed the young people present on the subject of "dying unconverted,"[8] Horace heard his mother groan, saw the look of anguished despair on her face, and his soul rebelled against the idea of such a cruel Creator. He declared hatred to "Infinite Malignity personified," though he believed he must suffer eternal punishment for so doing. The letter continues:

The childish image, familiar to his mind, of a crystal floor covered with angels and saints playing on harps and enjoying the fruits of the tree of life, in the New Jerusalem, as described in the book of Revelation,—under which scene, in full sight, was the hell so often emphatically described by Dr. Emmons,—recurred to his imagination; and deliberately, with all the tremendous force of his will, he chose to suffer with the latter, rather than make one with the selfish immortals who found happiness in witnessing torture.

[8] Dr. Emmons' son, Erastus, died at the age of thirty-two. Prior to his last illness, he had not experienced conversion, and his father suffered some misgivings relative to the validity of his deathbed experience. Dr. Emmons' biographer states that it had been his custom to preach an "appropriate sermon" on each Sabbath after a funeral, and he made no exception in the case of his own son. On the Sabbath after his burial, in closing his sermon he said: "This subject, and the late instance of mortality in this place, call aloud upon those in the midst of their days, to prepare to follow one of their own age into that vast eternity, whither he has gone and never to return. He lived stupid, thoughtless and secure in sin, until he was brought to the very sight of death. . . . He was brought to give up all his vain hopes and expectations from the world, and to feel the duty and importance of choosing the one thing needful. But whether he did ever heartily renounce the world and choose God for his supreme portion, cannot be known in this world. In his own view, he did become reconciled to God, and derived peace and hope from his supposed reconciliation. But it is more than possible, that like others on a sick-bed, he built his hopes upon a sandy foundation. His death, therefore, speaks with an emphasis to parents, brothers and sisters; and especially to those of his own age, to be wiser and better than he was; and not to delay seeking and serving God, to a dying hour. It is not I, but my son, who now preaches to you, whose voice once sounded pleasant in your ears. Be pleased, therefore, to hear his voice from the dead; and prepare to follow him to heaven, if he has been permitted to enter there."—Edwards A. Park: *Memoir of Nathanael Emmons: with Sketches of his Friends and Pupils*, pp. 433, 434.

The writer of this letter further states that the boy fully believed himself "lost," and the effect produced upon his nerves was "fearful." He expected that the "foul Fiend would appear from behind every hedge and tree to carry him off."

Mann wrote that from the day of the crisis, he began to construct a "theory of Christian ethics and doctrine respecting virtue and vice, rewards and penalties, time and eternity, God and his providence, which, with such modifications as advancing age and a wider vision" had brought, he still retained. His reaction against Calvinism continued throughout his life. He hated Calvinism. So lasting was the effect of the preaching heard in boyhood, that he wrote late in life that it had deprived him of "that filial love for God, that tenderness, that sweetness, that intimacy, that desiring, nestling love, which I say it is natural the child should feel towards a Father who combines all excellence." His soul had been deeply scarred by the terrible experience in childhood. He had later learned to believe in God's perfect goodness and excellence; but he wrote:

> I see him to be so, logically, intellectually, demonstratively; but when I would embrace him, when I would rush into his arms and breathe out unspeakable love and adoration, then the grim old Calvinistic spectre thrusts itself before me. I am as a frightened child, whose eye, knowledge, experience, belief even, are not sufficient to obliterate the image which an early fright burnt in upon his soul.[9]

So sure was he that the idea of God would frighten his own children, that he delayed as long as possible before imparting this knowledge to them. Mrs. Mann says that when the time came when the questions of his eldest child could be no longer avoided, he paced the room in great agitation. But when he saw that his boy readily accepted the idea of a loving heavenly Parent, the tears of joy came to express his relief. Mrs. Mann adds that from this time, the father and child found the joy of "trac-

[9] *Life*, p. 480.

ing God through his love and works" a never ending source of interest. Mann had a high regard for natural religion, and regarded the evidences of God's existence supplied by the physical universe as superior to those afforded by revelation.[10]

In mature years Mr. Mann became a Unitarian. He was an attendant at the Federal Street Church in Boston,[11] and had the deepest affection for its minister, Dr. William Ellery Channing. In 1848, after he had resigned the Secretaryship, he became one of the founders of the First Unitarian Society in Newton,[12] at West Newton, Massachusetts, whither he had moved in 1847.

If Horace Mann's childhood experience deprived him of the "filial love" for the heavenly Father for which he craved, he was, nevertheless, a deeply religious man. He reverenced the example of the life of Jesus Christ, and his religion found its fullest expression in service for humanity. We have noted his interest in temperance and the slavery question, and the fact that it was due to his efforts that the State Hospital for the Insane was founded at Worcester in 1830. We have seen with what complete dedication of all his life and energy he made his decision to leave his political career, and, as Secretary of the Board of Education, to devote himself to the "supremest welfare of mankind upon earth." We find him writing in his Journal on the day he became Secretary of the Board of Education: "I have faith in the improvability of the race,—in their accelerating improvability."

That faith never failed him. If failures should be encountered, they would only show how much yet needed to be done. In the darkest days of opposition, he could look forward to the next century when the cause for which he was pouring out his life

[10] *Life*, pp. 67, 68.

[11] Now the Arlington Street Church.

[12] I am indebted to Rev. Paul S. Phalen, and to Mr. Lawrence Shaw Mayo, of West Newton, Massachusetts, for this information taken from the records of the church.

should have raised up a new generation of men trained "to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with . . . God." He was willing to die for the cause, if need be, in a work which was destined to result in such great good to mankind. It may be said that he failed sufficiently to take into account such factors as home training and other environmental influences, and that he placed too great confidence in the "accelerating improvability of the race." But the fact remains that here was a man who loved his fellow men, and who found the best expression of his love for God in their service; who was eager to surround his "eighty thousand school children"[13] with influences which would teach them to love God and their neighbors, and who dared to dream, as another long ago had dared, that the day will come when men shall do unto others as they would that men should do unto them. Because he could not subscribe to the doctrines of "election" and "reprobation," because his ideas of God and of human nature did not harmonize with those of the Calvinism that had wounded his soul, he was denounced as an "infidel." Because he defended the Law of 1827, and withstood the efforts of those who would have violated it to attain their own ends, he was declared an "incendiary," a dangerous enemy who was seeking to banish the Bible and religion from the schools.

It should be noted, in the fifth place, that Mann was led to a false generalization regarding the nature and extent of the opposition of the Orthodox. This was probably due to a combination of factors, some of which grew out of his early religious experience. There is abundant evidence that the various attacks hurt him deeply. We have seen that he anticipated the possibility of martyrdom when he took up the work of the Secretaryship. His was an extremely sensitive nature, and quite lacking in that saving sense of humor that would have spared another man frequent annoyances. Mann himself recognized his own tendency

[13] This was a favorite expression which Mr. Mann often used. *Life*, p. iii.

to exaggerate the importance of some difficulties. In a letter written to his sister in 1848 he said:

It is the tendency of all of our blood to enter into any work, or into any feeling too intensely. Hence we are all inclined to make too serious matters of small ones; &, when matters are really serious, they absorb us, & incite & stimulate us, to a degree which our physical organization is not fitted to bear. We all have a tendency to extremes. I have felt this, & have contended against it as well as I could.

There are lines in some of his controversial writings that seem more severe than the occasions required. His closest friends regretted that he paid any attention to some who opposed him. This was especially true in the controversies with the Schoolmasters and Smith. In September, 1844, Sumner wrote to Dr. Howe:

I am very sorry the pedagogues of Boston have assailed Mann, and wish I could have joined in your counsels for his defence. To you and to Mann I should say, *Moderation!* I honor, almost revere, the zeal of the latter, and the ability by which it is sustained; but I sometimes doubt his judgment and taste.[14]

Theodore Parker, in a letter written after Mann's death in which he ranked Mann with Garrison and Emerson, wrote:

How he did work! how he did fight! how he licked the schoolmasters! If one of the little mosquitoes bit him, Mann thought he had never taken quite notice enough of the creature till he had smashed it to pieces with a 48-pound cannon-shot which rung throughout the land.[15]

Mann's early religious experience, with the ensuing complex against Orthodoxy, coupled with his extreme sensitiveness and lack of humor, resulted in a state of mind during the days of his controversies that led to an unwarranted generalization regarding his opponents. If an adversary happened to be of the Ortho-

[14] E. L. Pierce: *Memoir and Letters of Charles Sumner,* II, 319.
[15] John Weiss: *Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker,* II, 343.

dox faith, Mann immediately looked upon him as a representative of "the Orthodox" widely arrayed against himself. Several quotations will illustrate this false generalization.

After the appearance of Packard's *Four Letters* and the *Boston Recorder* articles, Mann wrote in his Journal, "Some efforts making by disappointed orthodoxy to disaffect the public with the Board." Then, as if remembering the loyal support of the Orthodox members of the Board, Dr. Davis and Dr. Robbins, and the resolution of confidence presented by the Orthodox Congregational minister, Dr. Fay, and supported by Rev. O. H. Dodge, the Orthodox Baptist, Mann continued, "They want, at least some of them, their doctrines introduced."[16]

In commenting on the Newton controversy in a letter to Combe, Mann wrote, "On the whole, it is believed that this will be the last effort of orthodoxy to secure admission of its doctrines into our schools." This, in spite of the fact that only a few lines above he had written, "As far as I can learn, I have almost all the other denominations on my side, and even the great mass of the Episcopalians themselves."[17]

Again, while the controversy with the Boston schoolmasters was at its height, Mann wrote to Combe, "The orthodox have hunted me this winter as though they were bloodhounds, and I a poor rabbit." But a few lines further on he divided them into two classes, and said the men assailing him were of the class "who are born orthodox, who are naturally or indigenously so; who, if they had had wit enough, would have invented orthodoxy, if Calvin had not." He then went on to say that all except the "ultra-orthodox" papers opposed the masters.[18]

This generalization which led Mr. Mann to write as if the Orthodox as a class were opposing him has doubtless had a large influence in fixing the tradition that regards him as the advocate of the secularized school. It has betrayed later writers into re-

[16] See p. 109. [17] See p. 188. [18] See pp. 193, 194.

peating his contradictory statements and helps us to understand why Mann's language would seem at times to contradict what is written in the next paragraph.

The sixth fact revealed by this study is that Mr. Mann had the support of the majority of all religious parties in the state. We have seen that men of differing religious convictions were agreed that the bitter religious controversies of the day should not divide the schools, and that on this account the Law of 1827 was passed almost unanimously; it was reënacted in 1835. It has also been clear that none of the members of the Board, with the exception of Newton and Gov. Morton, definitely opposed Mr. Mann, and that the Board, a majority of whom, after 1843, were Orthodox, reëlected him year after year for twelve years. Moreover, he was cordially supported by many men of the Orthodox faith who were not members of the Board.

It is highly significant that throughout the twelve years of Mr. Mann's work as Secretary, no general movement was made against him by any religious body. The nearest approach to any action of this sort occurred in the meeting of the Massachusetts General Association in 1848, where, as we have noted, a committee, appointed in 1847, submitted a report which expressed opposition to the Board, the Secretaryship, and the normal schools, but recommended that no action be taken. This happened three months after Mr. Mann had resigned.

In view of the facts that have been cited, it is clear that the opposition to Horace Mann did not represent the religious forces of the state, but that the attacks were made by individuals and groups who were comparatively isolated. Professor Cubberley, in an otherwise excellent summary of the opposition encountered by Mr. Mann, uses language in one or two instances which is likely to be misleading. He says:

> The educational awakening in Massachusetts, brought on largely by the work of Horace Mann, was to many a rude awakening. Among other things, it revealed that the old school of the Puritans had

gradually been replaced by a new and purely American type of school, with instruction adapted to democratic and national rather than religious ends. Mr. Mann stood strongly for such a conception of public education, and being a Unitarian, and the new State Board of Education being almost entirely liberal in religion, an attack was launched against them, and for the first time in our history the cry was raised that "The public schools are Godless schools." Those who believed in the old system of religious instruction, those who bore the Board or its Secretary personal ill-will, and those who desired to break down the Board's authority and stop the development of the public schools, united their forces in this first big attack against secular education. Horace Mann was the first prominent educator in America to meet and answer the religious onslaught.

A violent attack was opened in both the pulpit and the press. It was claimed that the Board was trying to eliminate the Bible from the schools, to abolish correction, and to "make the schools a counterpoise to religious instruction at home and in Sabbath schools." The local right to demand religious instruction was insisted upon.

Mr. Mann felt that a great public issue had been raised which should be answered carefully and fully. In three public statements he answered the criticisms and pointed out the errors in the argument. The Bible, he said, was an invaluable book for forming the character of children, and should be read without comment in the schools, but it was not necessary to teach it there. He showed that most of the towns had given up the teaching of the Catechism before the establishment of the Board of Education. He contended that any attempt to decide what creed or doctrine should be taught would mean the ruin of the schools. The attack culminated in the attempts of the religious forces to abolish the State Board of Education, in the legislatures of 1840 and 1841, which failed dismally. Most of the orthodox people of the State took Mr. Mann's side, and Governor Briggs, in one of his messages, commended his stand by inserting the following: "Justice to a faithful public officer leads me to say that the indefatigable and accomplished Secretary of the Board of Education has performed services in the cause of common schools which will earn him the lasting gratitude of the generation to which he belongs."[19]

[19] Ellwood P. Cubberley: *The History of Education. Educational Practice and Progress Considered as a Phase of the Development and Spread of Western Civilization,* pp. 692, 693. The same statement, with slight additions, is made in Professor Cubberley's *Public Education in the United States,* pp. 175, 176.

It is true that Mr. Mann stood strongly for a "type of school with instruction adapted to democratic and national . . . ends." But it is not quite just to him to contrast this type of school with the school adapted to religious ends, without defining terms. Horace Mann was opposed to sectarian doctrinal instruction in the schools, but he repeatedly urged the teaching of the elements of religion common to all of the Christian sects. He took a firm stand against the idea of a purely secular education, and on one occasion said he was in favor of religious instruction "to the extremest verge to which it can be carried without invading those rights of conscience which are established by the laws of God, and guaranteed to us by the Constitution of the State." At another time he said that he regarded hostility to religion in the schools as the greatest crime he could commit. Lest his name should go down in history as that of one who had attempted to drive religious instruction from the schools, he devoted several pages in his final Report—the twelfth—to a statement in which he denied the charges of his enemies.

Professor Cubberley says: "The attack culminated in the attempts of the religious forces to abolish the State Board of Education, in the legislatures of 1840 and 1841, which failed dismally." The words "the religious forces" are too comprehensive. While religious prejudice was the chief motive behind these attacks, they originated with scattered individuals, and evidence of anything like a general religious movement against Mr. Mann and the Board is lacking. But perhaps we should not be too insistent; for Professor Cubberley's next sentence contains the contradictory statement that "most of the Orthodox people sided with Mr. Mann."

Seventh, we conclude that the traditional view which holds Horace Mann responsible for the taking of religion out of the public schools of Massachusetts, and which regards him as the great protagonist of secularism in education is untrue.

We have seen that the Law of 1827, and not Mann or the

Board, was responsible for keeping sectarian religious instruction out of the schools. If these men had recommended sectarian books for use in the schools, or in any other way had lent their influence to the introduction of sectarian religious instruction, they would have been guilty of a violation of the spirit of the law, if not of the letter. In order to make it possible for them legally to introduce Packard's "Select Library" into the schools, it would have been necessary for them first to seek the repeal of the Law of 1827, an action which probably would have resulted in the speedy destruction of the Board, but which, if successful, would have destroyed the common school system of the state. Mann stood firmly with the Board against the violation of the law attempted by Packard, and advocated by the report of the majority of the Committee on Education in 1840, by Newton and the *Witness* in 1844, and by Smith in 1847.

The course of Mann and the Board in organizing the normal schools does not reveal any "design" to banish religion from the system of public education. At least five prominent teachers of unquestioned evangelical faith declined to accept places of leadership in those institutions before Cyrus Peirce was secured for Lexington. The first principal of the Barre Normal School, Rev. S. P. Newman, was an Orthodox teacher. Rev. Calvin E. Stowe, another Orthodox educator, declined to become his successor, and when the school was moved to Westfield the principalship was filled by Rev. Emerson Davis, the Orthodox minister of that place. The Board directed that "the principles of piety and morality, common to all sects of Christians" should be included in the curriculum of the normal schools, and required a portion of the Bible to be read daily.

Far from taking religion out of the schools Mr. Mann sought in positive fashion to meet the situation created by the Law of 1827 and to devise a constructive, non-sectarian program of moral and religious education which would be in accordance with the terms of the law. It was largely due to his advocacy that

the Bible was almost universally used in the schools before he resigned the Secretaryship. He abhorred the idea of a purely secular curriculum. He saw clearly the issue presented by the Law of 1827, and the danger of the ultimate secularization of the schools. In his *First Report* he sounded a note which he struck again and again throughout his administration. In his lectures on education, in occasional addresses, in the *Reports,* in the *Common School Journal,* in letters, and in the privacy of his own Journal, his burning conviction that the safety of society depends upon the education of the young in religion and ethics was forcefully expressed. He saw the futility of depending on mere doctrinal instruction to influence conduct, and in his second letter to Packard he suggested a method of religious education which he doubtless would have developed but for the sectarian opposition which was soon encountered.

In favoring instruction in the elements of religion common to all Christian sects, Mann again was standing firmly for the law of the state. There were some critics who insisted that this would favor the Unitarians, and so actually amount to sectarian instruction. The *New York Observer*[20] in 1838, had argued that to teach only those doctrines in which all Christians agree would reduce the teaching to natural religion and morality, "the lowest . . . form of Unitarianism," and continued:

> It makes Unitarianism the guide of the state in matters of religion. Who, but Unitarians, will consent to that?

The charge of sectarianism made against Mann and the Board was not uncommon. Newton and the *Christian Witness* had insisted that the teaching of anything less than the evangelical doctrines of the gospel was sectarian. The charge was made repeatedly during the various controversies. The *Boston Recorder* said editorially in the issue of November 18, 1847, that Mann was guilty of "the worst kind of sectarianism."

[20] See p. 87.

By such sectarian jealousies the teaching of non-sectarian religion was hindered in the days of Horace Mann. He saved the public schools from the destruction that would have followed had the agents of reaction had their way. He was not able to arrest the tide of secularization that has robbed our schools of religion. The secularized school of today is the result of just such jealousy on the part of Roman Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, and the price we are paying in juvenile delinquency and adult crime is high.

Horace Mann was not called upon to face the Roman Catholic position which holds that the Bible is itself a sectarian book. Newton pointed out in 1844 that if a Papist should become a member of the Board of Education he could object to the Protestants' translation of the Bible. But this question did not become acute until after the close of Horace Mann's work in the Massachusetts schools.

Appendices

Appendix A

THE PACKARD-MANN CORRESPONDENCE

Letter No. 1 from Mr. Packard is missing, as is subsequently stated in the correspondence.

No. 2

Boston, March 18, 1838.

F. A. Packard Esq.

Dear Sir:

I received your letter of Mar. 7th some days since, & immediately addressed a copy of the *Report* requested, to you. This I had intended to do, & was only waiting to ascertain your Christian name.

I had never read "Abbott's Child at Home." I immediately asked a bookseller to supply me with a copy, which he delayed to do for several days, & I hope you will accept this as an apology for so late a reply.

I have read the book tho' rather hastily, and I cannot hesitate a moment in saying, that it would not be tolerated in this State, as a District School Library book.

This dear Sir, is an answer to your inquiry, but it may be, that you would like to be informed of the reasons of the opinion expressed. I will therefore, take the liberty to state one or two of them.

The book would be in the highest degree, offensive to the Universalists. In this State, we have about 300 towns: & there are more than one hundred *societies* of Universalists; & besides, very many of that denomination are scattered all over the State amongst other denominations.

The clergymen especially manifest great interest in our common schools. I do not think that the clergymen of any other denomination take *more,* if so much, interest in our schools as they do, in proportion to their numbers; & I do not think it too much to say, that many, if not most of them would rather see the whole system abolished than to have such a book introduced. I would refer you, on this point to such passages as those on pp. 13th & 28th. (I have the 10th edition.)

The whole scope & tenor of the book would ill accord with the views of Unitarians, whether clergymen or laymen:—among other things, for the following reasons:—

It makes scarcely a perceptible discrimination between offences (indeed I do not know as it makes any)—denouncing eternal perdition for the most trivial neglects or acts of disobedience, committed in the thoughtlessness of childhood; & of course classing them, in regard to consequences, with a whole life of heaven-contemning wickedness. In this respect, the book would shock the moral & religious feelings of a large portion of our community.

The manner in which the book enforces the duty of obedience would be excepted to, as arbitrary & mechanical. In the book, obedience takes so conspicuous a place, that one would suppose the author considered it as the highest virtue. Many of our people believe that affection and love to God, is a far higher and more desirable feeling to inspire, than blind obedience, and that the book forgets the higher in urging the lower state of mind. Besides this injunction of obedience supposes, that there is no doubt, as to the nature of the command. But to settle the question, what is commanded? is often the most difficult part of the case; & therefore, they would say, it is of much higher consequence to inspire a love of duty, as one of the best councillors in determining what our duty may be, as well as in securing its performance.

Again, it would be said, that the book dwells far more on future, & perhaps remote, retribution, & less on the immediate, & instantaneous effects of bad conduct, upon a child's mind, than is right: A child has comparatively a dim perception of the future, but a very lively one of the present. When a child does any thing, without knowing it to be wrong, then the act is not wrong, & he ought not to be threatened with punishment for it. If the child knows the act to be wrong, then remorse is inevitable; & in regard to children, at least, the attention should be mainly directed to this fact, in the constitution of its own nature.

There is scarcely anything in the book which presents the character of God in an amiable, or lovely aspect. Gratitude is enjoined, without presenting that combination of qualities, which excites gratitude. Nor is the Deity invested in the book, with the attributes which excite *affection* & this is a far better state of mind than gratitude.

It is very remarkable, that, while the whole book proceeds upon the ground, that children have a natural disinclination to love what is good & to hearken to what is wise in their Maker; yet, in the last chapter, the elements of faith & love & obedience are stated with great clearness, and their natural, and inevitable effects are regarded as laws of the moral nature. "The worst dispositioned boy in the world *cannot help admiring generosity.*" "If you habitually act upon this principle"

(that of kindness) *"you will never want for friends"*—"Henry—knows you give up," (the bat) "to accommodate him. *How can he help liking you for it.*" "The fact is that neither man nor child can cultivate a spirit of generosity & kindness, *without attracting affection and esteem.*" "This is not *peculiar to childhood, but is the same in all periods of life.*" p. 150. Again, "If you are not loved, *it is good evidence, that you do not deserve to be loved.*" p. 148. Now tens of thousands of our people will say, this is just as true when God, as when man, is the object; i.e. if God be represented in his true character. But my page is almost full, & I will not trouble you with another. I am sorry I have not had time to put these views in better shape, but if I had not seized upon a leisure half-hour, at the present time, I must have delayed an answer several days longer. I hope however I have given you some *hints,* why the book would be offensive here.

Very respectfully,
HORACE MANN.

No. 3

Office of the Am S S Union
Philadelphia March 28 1838

Hon Horace Mann
Boston (Mass)

My dear Sir, Your favor of the 18th inst was received on the 23d and I am quite obliged to you for your prompt reply to my inquiry & for the frank manner in which you have expressed your views. I hope you will not be frightened at another letter from me, supposing it to be ominous of a long & perplexing controversy, for nothing I assure you is farther from my desire or purpose. I proposed to you the "Child at Home" as a test of your opinion—1st because Mr. Abbott is a *New England* writer of some celebrity and 2d because his book has already been introduced into a Common School library (strictly so called); and I might add 3dly because—I could not expect one of our own publications could be examined (for the purpose of ascertaining their fitness for circulation in Common Schools) without considerable prejudice.

Without expressing any opinion of the "Child at Home" or of the objections which you suggest to it, I must beg the favor of you to examine (at least cursorily) the few books of which I subjoin the titles. I have written to Mr. Tappan (the Agent of the Society 22 Court St., Boston) and have requested him to give you copies of the books—and my only request is that you will examine them sufficiently

to *specify* such objections as seem to you insurmountable, to their circulation in Common Schools. They are specimens of different classes of our publications fitted to the smallest as well as to the highest classes. I do not say that if I am capable of preparing books expressly for Common Schools & were appointed by the Legislature of Massachusetts to do it, that I should prepare such books as those I am about to name. I would certainly modify them in many important particulars—and yet I know of nothing in either of these volumes that can reasonably offend the great mass of the friends & supporters of Common Schools in that State.

I had marked the very passages to which you allude on pages 13 & 28 of the "Child at Home" and am perfectly aware how very offensive they would be to Universalists. But at the same time it is difficult for me to conceive how the "principles of piety" are to be "impressed on the minds of children & youth" as required by the law of your State, without reference to the character & government of God. Nor can I conceive how the character & government of God can be introduced for the purpose of illustrating & enforcing these principles of piety, without *"favoring some particular religious tenet"* which is expressly forbidden by the Statute of 1826, at least so far as schoolbooks are concerned. The very definition of piety is *"discharge of duty to God,"* and how can the principles of piety be taught intelligibly without constant reference to the character of God & to the provisions & sanctions of his law as revealed in the Holy Scriptures? My own impression is that all which it is intended to keep out of public schools, may be kept out & yet a vast number of religious books strictly speaking may be admitted. If however a system of religious instruction can be devised which shall truly & faithfully inculcate the principles of piety and show the pupil that these principles, carried out, will promote their *future happiness*—without inculcating the doctrine of *future accountability*—so far so good. One of your objections to the "Child at Home" is very just, that it dwells more on the future & remote retribution than on immediate and instantaneous effects of bad conduct. Is it not, nevertheless, true that the present pain or exposure to pain, is willingly suffered for the sake of the forbidden pleasure? So far as my knowledge of children & youth in the lower classes of society enables me to judge, the shame and suffering attendant on a course of sin, is not sufficient *generally* to deter them from committing it. I agree that it is a part of our moral constitution that remorse should follow wrong doing, & so it is a part of our physical constitution that pain & disease shall follow intemperance, but what

effect has this knowledge of this fact on 99/100 of mankind in childhood or in riper years. You also object to the book because it presents the character of God in no amiable or attractive light. I am sure this ought to be done, but we are informed on the highest authority that *the fear* of God is the beginning of knowledge. Ought not his character as a being of infinite purity, holiness & justice to be presented as prominently as the attributes of love & mercy & forbearance? Will not a just view of the divine character combine these attributes? So that justice shall be the very image of mercy & the reverse? I can conceive of a character in which these attributes shall exist in most perfect harmony or rather be so perfectly blended that they cannot be contemplated apart. I would willingly spend an hour & cover another sheet of paper in following out a single idea in your report p. 58-59. "*The false projecting power of the mind,*—the power which sends out the error, this is to be discovered & rectified"—but you would feel as if it were a poor return for your frank & full answer to my inquiry to tax you with such a disquisition.

I beg you would take a little time to examine the books of which I will subjoin the titles & especially those marked X if you have not time or inclination for all. I have no purpose to promote which is not common to any good citizen of our country. Please take the trouble to hand the order to Mr. Tappan— Very truly yours, &c

FRED. A. PACKARD.

930 Hymns for Children
931 George Hicks
944 Sixpenny Glass of Wine X
953 Evening at Uncle Wards X[1]
957 Murdered Mother X
958 Autumn Walk
963 Kindest friend X
966 Four ()ictareens[1] X
1114 The Watch Chain X
1118 Harvest
1129 Blind Lucy X
1217 Robert Benton X
1219 Sketches from the Bible
1226 The sisters X
1227 Good Law[1]
1236 Memoir of an officer X
1325 House of Refuge
1326 ————————[1]
1417 Christian Politeness X
1419 Popular superstitions
1422 Infidel Class X
1424 } Travels about home
1425 }
1601 Rev. Edwards
1617 Grandfather Gregory X
1618 Western ————[1]
1626 Harvey boys X
1701 Anna Rise[1]
1707 Bedouin Arabs
1716 Ring leader
2002 Edward & Miriam X
2103 Telumel
2301 Washington X
2608 March & his hares[1]
3101 Gray X
3501 L Ell
3901 Only Sin X

[1] The writing is poor and in several cases cannot be read with certainty.

No. 4 is missing, as is afterward stated.

No. 5

Boston June 23, 1838.

F. A. Packard, Esq.

Dear Sir.

After two or three weeks absence from the city, I returned last evening, when I found your note accompanied by the favor of a Primmer & Spelling-book. I beg you to accept my acknowledgements for them.

In your note you express a regret that I did not answer your last letter. I read it over once for the very purpose of learning whether you had been thinking of a reply while writing it, & came to the conclusion you had not, & I thought it better to omit the civility of an acknowledgement, than to tax you with the postage of a letter. Otherwise I should have answered it & I am sorry you should have tho't it possible I had taken offence. I confess I do not like polemics. Such vast, such indefinite good may be accomplished by a union of effort on those points, on which we all agree, that it seems a little better than suicidal perpetually to fasten our attention upon those wherein we differ.

I am very desirous to learn what success is found to attend the experiment of teaching *words* before *letters*. They are now adopting that course in this city, & I believe, with general approval. It seems to me most Philosophical. It has been suggested to me, however, by an experienced teacher, that it is only a transposition of labor;—that tho' it will be easy to teach words first, it will be difficult to teach the letters composing them afterwards. It is a case where I should not be decided by a *majority* of voices nor even by a unanimity, *the first quarter*. It is certainly a very important question in the process, & I hope it will receive the attention of minds competent to decide it correctly. You must allow me to say in reference to both books, that tho' I am no artist, I cannot admire the *cuts*. Is it not of great consequence, what models, emblems, pictures, children are accustomed to look upon, especially when their minds are in a state of agreeable excitement? I know the expense of fine work cannot—or rather will not—be borne—still the pictures ought not to be such as to hit the child's ideality on the wrong side, & inspire fear instead of admiration.

However well adapted your Spelling-book may be to the growth & progressiveness of young minds; it has numerous passages, which

would exclude it from the schools in Massachusetts;—such as are to be found in the 9th & 18th Reading lessons, for instance. For my own part, I should object still more strenuously to the idea inculcated in the 31st Lesson,—that of referring the common events of life to Divine interposition. It seems to me the most dangerous of all teaching,—tending more than anything else to unsettle all sound notions, respecting the constitution of the system in which we are placed,—which is a system of fixed, unrepealed, unsuspended laws, & whoever transgresses them, or comes in collision with them, knowingly, or ignorantly, be he saint or sinner, must suffer the consequences. Besides that belief cuts both ways. How can a child who has adopted such views, account for the disastrous terminations which happen to the enterprises of good boys, or for the fortunate ones which crown the exploits of the wicked? The falling of a brick depends in no degree upon a boy's moral character or conduct, but wholly upon the laws of gravitation, & to teach so, it seems to me is to teach an error, which will probably be the seed of crimes.

In your former letter you institute a course of argument to show that the passages which I marked in the "Child at Home," as offensive to Universalists, may still be taught, within the express provisions of our law, because that law requires that the "principles of piety" shall be "impressed upon the minds of children & youth"; & as piety is the discharge of our duty to God, & as that duty cannot be discharged, without a knowledge of his character & attributes, it follows that to teach the principles of piety, we must teach that character, and those attributes—that is, Mr. Abbott's views of them, as expressed in the passages, referred to;—nay, if I understand the comprehensiveness of the conclusion, the principles of piety cannot be taught without doing so. Is it possible, my dear Sir, you can mean to say; that no person who does not adopt those views can be *pious!* Is no Universalist *pious?* And who is he that understands the character and attributes of God? tho' we may talk about His infinite holiness & perfect justice, yet how little more than words they are in the mouths even of the greatest and purest of mortals! What are even their conceptions of infinity—of perfection? I would not say merely, that such a definition of piety never was contemplated by the framers of the law; but it seems to me that such a definition excludes & must forever exclude piety from the *created* universe. There not only is not, but there never can be a *pious* being in it.

Another topic is animadverted upon. Tho' you allow we are so constituted, that remorse follows wrong-doing—that pain and disease

follow intemperance;—yet you say these consequences are not *generally* sufficient repellants. And why?—Not as I believe from any mistake or oversight in the original constitution of man, nor from any love of error or wrong, into which they have since fallen, but because the earthly portion of their natures is highly cultivated, while their moral and religious sentiments are mainly neglected. The whole moral nature is left almost a waste, & the sublime pleasures, which attend its activity are not known, & instead of cultivating the religious nature, all effort is expended upon the inculcation of doctrines & creeds, & the modes of adroitly defending them. A creed, an intellectual conviction, however strong, is not the natural antagonist of an earthly propensity:—the pleasures of a moral sentiment, of contemplating goodness, of doing good,—these *antagonize*, & I believe, would do so successfully if they were but one tenth part as much cultivated as the former. At most there can be no more pleasure in a creed, than in a logical exercise. Hence it seldom proves a match for the impulses. Some of our propensities have been so much indulged and exercised, that they demand their gratification, tho' it be at the expense of our better sentiments, which have been neglected, and inactive, but it is not for the pain's sake, nor for the wrong's sake. But suppose those sources of happiness were pointed out, which involve no consequences of pain or wrong, their conformity to our moral constitution shown, their coincidence with the Divine will made manifest, then our relations to the *earth*—as such—would occupy their proper sphere,—not extirpated but controlled, not destroyed but subordinated.

But I had no idea of writing this, when I sat down, & I cannot suppose it will modify views, so long-considered as your own. You must excuse my plainness of speech. My feelings are certainly respectful. I shall be glad to hear from you again, tho' I do not think I shall be led to reply again at such length and in the discussion of such topics.

Yrs. very respectfully
Horace Mann

No. 6

Boston July 5 1838

F. A. Packard Esq.
Dear Sir,

Within two or three days after my late interview with you at my rooms in Boston, I had occasion to leave the city, from which I

have been absent until last evening. The first piece of information, I learned on my return was one which equally surprised & grieved me. I was informed, from a source, which I should not for a moment think of questioning, were it not for the almost incredible nature of the fact communicated, that at a meeting of the "General Association of Massachusetts" held last week at New Bedford, (where I recollect you told me you were going the next morning) having obtained leave to speak, you stated, among other things, that the Board of Education of this State would recommend books for schools that were anti-evangelical, and that, after the correctness of that statement had been explicitly denied by a Member of the Board, who alleged facts, proving its utter groundlessness, you then held up a letter, said it was from Mr. Mann & that it would sustain the charge, you had made.

I feel, Sir, an insuperable reluctance to express the feelings, which such information derived from so authentic a source, excites within me, before stating the case, with frankness to you & offering to make any substantial explanation welcome. You will perceive on a moment's reflection, that the violation of the confidence of private intercourse, which the information if correct supposes; the utter falsity of any such declaration, if any such were made, and the grievous consequences, which must necessarily result, if the slightest credence were given to it, make the affair one of great importance to me, and to the cause of human improvement thro' the means of education, which, if I know my own heart, I am willing to support, with my health & if need be with my life. You must allow me, therefore to make two requests. The first is that you will give me an account of what was said & done by yourself in relation to the letter, to me & to the Board of Education, so that, if you were in fact misapprehended, the error may be rectified. The other is, that you will return me the original letter which you held up as a voucher on that occasion, in order that I may be able to satisfy the Board of the incorrectness of the representation, as it has gone abroad. I have not the slightest objection to your retaining a copy of the letter if you choose, as it contains nothing, which on any proper occasion for making public I have the shadow of a desire to conceal. But for the satisfaction of the Board and of my friends, I desire the possession of the original. I hope I may hear from you as early as your convenience will allow.

Yours with due respect,

Horace Mann.

No. 7

American S S Union
Philada July 9 1838

Hon Horace Mann
(Boston)
Dear Sir,

Yours of the 5th inst was recd this morning, and it requires no time, or deliberation to furnish you with a frank & simple statement of the proceeding to which it related.

Soon after we had prepared a Select Library for Common Schools, I addressed a long official letter to Gov. Everett explaining the Society's object in this enterprise—and endeavoring to convince him that the introduction of these books into public schools would be highly beneficial & could not be justly opposed upon the grounds of sectarianism in any fair & proper construction of that term. To this letter I beg to refer you for a description of the character &c of the library. I stated to Gov. E. that the object of my communication was to *secure for the Library the notice of the Board of Education,* & others who might be interested in the subject.

A few weeks after this, Mr. Tappan, our Agent in Boston, informed us that Mr. Mann had called there and expressed the opinion that the Library would not answer for schools in Massachusetts, for the books were sectarian, & so esteemed by the Gov^{r}. I was sure you could not have examined the books very thoroughly, and was moreover inclined to believe that the source whence they were received might have prejudiced your mind. At this juncture I recd from Geneseo N. Y. a copy of the catalogue of a Common School Library in one of the school districts of that town, in which I found *"Abbott's Child at Home."* As this book was popular, & published by the trade, I thought I might test your views by it, better than by one of our publications; & forwarded it to you, for the purpose of ascertaining, whether it would be regarded as an admissible book. You promptly replied that it would not be admitted & among the reasons 1st because it *inculcated the doctrine of a future state of rewards & punishments*—that very many of the most active friends of popular Education in Massachusetts were Universalists & that much as they loved the system, they would rather give it up, than have those views taught, & 2d, that it presented the character of the Deity in a revolting aspect—whereas if presented truly it would command the love & admiration, of every intelligent being, &c &c. These objections

were amplified and illustrated at large. I replied to them as well as I could & forwarded a copy of our new Spelling book & Primer, and wished you to examine them, expressing my own strong convictions of their superiority.

When I went to Boston lately, I was promised an interview with you, which I enjoyed. At this time we had a free & full interchange of views for an hour. You expressed your views very freely on the *general subject* of Religious Education & advanced the opinion that the mind of a child, should not be influenced on this subject until its judgement is sufficiently matured to weigh the evidence & arguments for itself, that the doctrines of revealed religion could not be safely connected with a course of public instruction &c &c. At the close of our interview you gave me a letter which you had prepared but for some good cause had delayed to send by mail. Upon returning to my lodgings, I read this letter & found your objections to the Spelling book, to be against those topics that inculcated the doctrine of a future state of rewards & punishments, & also the lesson or series of lessons which teaches what is usually called the doctrine of *Special Providence.*

On my way to New Bedford the next day I fell in company with Rev. Mr. Worcester of Salem with whom I had much conversation. He introduced the subject of the schools in Salem, & the discourse led to the very point we had discussed the evening before, and I did not hesitate to ask his opinion upon your views & to speak of their influence if generally prevalent. When I had an opportunity to commend to the favorable consideration of the clergymen at New Bedford our Library for Schools, I adverted to the former character of the public schools in that ancient Commonwealth, to the period when the Schoolmaster was set apart to his office with solemn religious ceremonies & when the doctrines of the Christian religion were an indispensable part & parcel of the system of public instruction. I also observed that great improvements were making in this matter if they could be called so.—I feared, however, that we might be deluded. I had reason to believe that the opinion of the Secretary of the Board of Education was that no book would be introduced into the schools that could be regarded as sectarian, & that the inculcation of the doctrines of a future state of rewards & punishments & of a special providence would be excluded on that ground—that such views of the character of the Deity as would not naturally excite the love & admiration of the beholder would be objectionable. "If this class of opinions is to prevail

at the Board of Education" I continued "it becomes Ministers of the Gospel & Christian people throughout the Commonwealth to see to it, for that I did not believe such views would be current among the mass of the best friends of Education in that State." I do not mean to say that this was the *exact* phraseology of my remarks but that it is the spirit and substance of them, I have no doubt.

As soon as I had done I left the house to prepare for my return to this city & while packing my valise (I will not vouch for the orthography) I was summoned back to the meeting by a friend who told me that one of the Board of Education was about to reply to my remarks. I hastened back & heard the Rev Mr Robbins state in substance that he was a member of the Board of Education & was surprised to hear what had been said—that that Board had very great responsibilities which they hoped to perform with all good fidelity—that nothing had been done in recommending any book or expressing any decision on the subject except that one principle had been settled viz. that no book should be recommended but with the concurrence of every individual member of the Board. *He was sure that no person had any authority to making any intimations on this subject.*

As this reply did not pertain to any remarks of mine, I did not feel as if any reply was necessary. Some member of the Body however, moved that as Mr. Packard was present he should have an opportunity to reply, or explain; and inasmuch as this motion implied that explanation was necessary and as a superficial hearer might construe Mr. Robbins' remark into a denial of my authority to say what I did, I briefly recapitulated what I had said, viz. that the library now offered to the schools did illustrate the great doctrines of the Christian faith—and was pervaded with the spirit of Christianity—that the views of the Secretary of the Board of Education of that State would exclude certain of those doctrines (naming them)—*as sectarian* & that *if these views should prevail at the Board of Education,* then the good people & especially the clergy of Massachusetts—the fast friends of Education—should see to it at once. If the entertainment of these views by the Secretary of that Board was called in question I was ready to substantiate what I had said & opened your letter.[2]

[2] The following is in the margin of the original: "It never entered into my head to take [here two words are missing, being cut out by unsealing the letter; they are supposed to be 'your letter'] with me, and I probably should not have thought of resorting to it to defend myself from any [here a word or two cut out as above, supposed to be 'imputation, had'] it not been in my pocket-book. It was the result of the moment."

Before reading the clause which would support me, I observed that the Secretary was a highly honorable gentleman & I presumed had no idea that his letter would be used for this purpose. But if—here several members rose and hoped the letter would not be read & a gentleman (I believe Rev Mr Wilder of Concord) observed "that there was no need of it, for he had personally heard Mr Mann express the same views which had been ascribed to him." Mr Robbins then stated *that Mr Mann was not a member of the Board of Education*—& here the whole matter ended. I confess I regretted very much the necessity of defending what I said by a reference to your letter & was happy to be saved the reading of it, and I was sorry upon reflection that I had not said, that as Mr Robbins remarks had no reference to what I had advanced, I saw no occasion to reply—but it seemed like an impeachment of my authority or of the truth of what I had said; & this I felt bound to meet.

This so far as I recollect is a simple history of the matter from beginning to end. I have ever regarded the views you have expressed to me, as the views of a public man, and as designed to affect a very important enterprise of ours in behalf of Common Schools in our country. My own views (if they are of any consequence) I have committed to you under the same impression & feel bound by them anywhere & every where. I should not feel at liberty to publish your letters in the public newspapers without your consent first had & obtained,—but should not hesitate to speak of them on all proper occasions & to show their fallacy as well as I was able. I found at New Bedford a convention representing, I presume, a majority of the Christian taxpayers of Massachusetts & men whose influence if fairly & legitimately exerted would go far towards giving character to the Educational institutions of Massachusetts. I was there to obtain their favor towards our library and it became me to show that some efficient action was necessary to secure its salutary influence on Common School children of that State. Unless there were known or supposed to be opposite opinions of the subject no occasion for effort might appear, and hence the pertinency & propriety of stating what were understood to be the views entertained by the highest & most influential man connected with public instruction in the State & who might be supposed to understand thoroughly the ground on which the system was to be carried out & built up. That these views were intended to be *confidentially* expressed, I presume you will not say, nor wish to have them considered so. At all events, no intimation of

the kind is given or implied in the correspondence, so far as I recollect. —I have no secrets on this subject & I am sure (if I know your character) you have none. My views relative to this *one point* have been long ago settled & expressed, & have received the cordial concurrence & most flattering approbation of some of the best & wisest men in New England & among them several who agree with you in religious sentiments. I send you a marked pamphlet, that you may connect my established views, with my present proceedings & see that it is not a new notion or something designed to excite public notice. In attempting to convert others to these opinions, I meet a man holding one of the most commanding positions in the country, (so far as the interests of public instruction are concerned) & withal prepared to express his views strongly, decidedly & emphatically in direct opposition to my theory. He has constant opportunities to inculcate those views & does it, virtually in public documents. Surely I am justified, in every aspect of the case, in making known those opposing views, in showing their unsoundness & fallacy & pernicious tendency (if I can) & especially when my official correspondence has made me acquainted with them & my official duty requires me (as it did on the late occasion) to combat them or show their character that others may combat them.

If I have been betrayed into any error of motive or action I refuse not to make any reparation that justice or Christian courtesy may require—I have given you the facts according to the best of my recollection—You will perceive *that they are totally different in their character & impression from what was stated to you.* For their correctness I appeal to Rev Mr Albro of Cambridge, Mr. Brainard of this city, (who were among the gentlemen present & known to me) & also to Rev Mr Smith & Mr Tappan our agents who were also present. I send you the original letter as you request retaining a copy (certified) and shall feel at liberty still to use the correspondence & conversation between us, on any proper occasion, publicly, being assured by your last letter, of what I presumed to be the case before, "that there is nothing in them which you have the shadow of a desire to conceal."

Yours respectfully

Fred. A Packard

P.S. I feel bound to state that I have not retained copies of the letters I addressed to you nor have I yet placed your letters on the Society's files. The object of the whole correspondence has been to ascertain what were the views of the Secretary of the Board of Public

Education in Massachusetts respecting our Common School Library? Our agent reported to us that he objects to them as sectarian. I have freely conversed with my colleagues and members of our Board on the views you have expressed, nor have I supposed myself in this, or any other use which I have made of the letters, as violating any confidence. If I have assumed any obligation to receive them confidentially, I have no reccollection of it & have sinned ignorantly. If I am not asking too much, I would be quite obliged by a copy of my letters to you & will pay the expense of copying them, or Mr. Tappan will copy them & return them to you.

No. 8

Boston July 11th, 1838.

F. A. Packard Esq.
Dear Sir

I forward, according to your request, just received, a copy of the only one of your letters, which I preserved, or at all events, which I can find. I believe there were two others, one previous & one subsequent to the above. The first requested my opinion, whether Abbott's "Child at Home," would be acceptable to our School districts for a School Library Book, & the principal point in the last was a request that I would answer your letter,—the one copied above. I have been able to give your letter recd tonight but a hasty perusal. *I have several things to say in relation to its contents,* but I am at present overwhelmed with engagements. I would answer it tonight, but it is now past midnight & my health is feeble & now suffering. In the meantime, I request [you] to forward me my first letter to you, (preserving a copy if you desire so to do) as I find, by your own confession, that that letter was also referred to by you, at N Bedford & its spirit & object misrepresented.

Yours &c
Horace Mann

No. 9

Am S S Union
Philada July 16 1838.

Horace Mann Esq
Dear Sir,

I recd yours of the 11th inst covering a copy of my letter of March 28. and send you by return mail the original of yours of March 18, having retained a certified copy, as you suggest.

I shall look with some impatience for the "several things you have to say in relation to the contents" of my last letter, and shall hope for a very explicit statement of the points in which I *"misrepresented its spirit & object";* and as this is rather a serious offence, rather harshly set forth, you will not think me unreasonable if I ask you to give me, *in the most direct & tangible form,* the evidence on which it rests.

Yours respectfully
FRED A PACKARD

No. 10

Boston July 22, 1838.

F. A. Packard Esq.[3]
Dear Sir

I avail myself of the earliest opportunity which my health, and engagements allow, to write you. I earnestly hope it may be, at least on my part, the last of a correspondence, which was unsought for by me & which has already been perverted to the injury of a cause I have deeply at heart. In a former letter, and when I did not foresee, that any unwarrantable use would be made of my correspondence, I gave you very distinct intimations that I wished to eschew controversy on theological subjects. Such would be my strong preference under any circumstances, but especially so as I occupy an official station, under laws which expressly enact, that *The School Committee shall never direct to be purchased or used in any of the Town Schools any school books which are calculated to favor the tenets of any particular sect of Christians.* Of this law you were aware, because you referred to it in a former letter. Nor is it a new enactment. For many years it has been in operation with almost universal acceptance. In a Legislature of more than five hundred men, I do not believe that in any year for ten years past, during which time I have been acquainted with most of the members, that ten men could have been found who would vote for its repeal. It has been ratified by an almost unanimous public opinion. The people have acted almost uniformly in accordance with its spirit. In towns where there are clergymen of different Denominations all are generally put upon the "School Committee." If too numerous, the different sects are represented in rotation. In some places where there is a strong feeling against having any clergy-

[3] The original of this letter is missing. This is copied from a copy of all the Mann-Packard letters made by someone for Mann. A checking of this copy book with the extant originals shows many errors made by the copyist.

men on the Board, all are left off by unanimous consent. The great idea is, that those points of doctrine, or faith, upon which good, and great Men differ, shall not be obtruded into this mutual ground of "The Schools." The Children of Men of all Denominations, attend the school together. If one man claimed to have his peculiar doctrines taught, why not another? why not all?—until you would have a Babel of Creeds in the same school, which a Heathen would be ashamed of. All therefore, or almost all amongst us acceded to the essential justice, as well as the practical expediency of this Course. Though each one cannot have his children taught all he could wish, yet they may be taught many invaluable things,—the Rudiments of Knowledge, propriety of manners, social duty, practical Morality. The tendency of all this, is most happy. It brings opponents to act in concert together for the attainment of a great good—and thereby restores the lost feelings of Brotherhood which Controversy tends to obliterate—Besides, suppose there were attempts to teach peculiar tenets in the Schools, and the Schools were thereby broken up, as they undoubtedly would be, each advocate for the course would be as far from his object as he was before—Now Sir can you for a moment suppose, that if I had foreknown the use to which my Letters have been put; If I had foreknown that they would be made the ground of an assault upon the Board of Education; that "The Board," would have been arraigned at the Bar of a large Public Assembly in this State—and the Letters referred to as a proof of their Guilt; That the Letters would have been held up as an alarm; That a war cry would have been uttered, "that the good people, and especially the Clergy of Mass. should see to it at once," that it should defeat, or alter the plans of the Board; I say can you believe if I had foreknown any part of these Consequences, that I would have been drawn in to examine any Books at your request, would have answered your inquiries at such length amidst my other engagements, placed myself Voluntarily in a Situation to be (— — —)[4] and even put a weapon into your hands, by which the injury could be inflicted? Had I foreseen this in the beginning, I trust I should have given you a civil answer, but I assure you, it would not have been a long one. But you approached me in the guise of a friend; You made a request of me, which I was in no wise bound except in Courtesy to answer, which however I did answer, at a good deal of personal inconvenience to myself, as well as I was able, and you assured me that you

[4] The text is obscure. The words probably are "persecuted and wronged."

"had no purpose to promote which was not Common to every good Citizen of his Country." In your reply to my first Letter, you professed much Obligation to me, talked of my frankness quite as much as good taste would permit, echoed back many of the views I had presented, declared that you had marked the "very passages" in the Book as "offensive" which I had done; alleged that another of the "objections" was "just," "agreed" with me in regard to one of the main parts of our "Moral Constitution," and was "sure" that one most important thing, which I said had not been attended to, in the Book, "ought to be done." In this Long Letter, you so far put me off my guard as to the ulterior use to which my Letters might be put, that instead of asking me to reply to you, you said, near the close, that you "would willingly fill another sheet to me." Not thinking that you desired or expected a reply to that Letter, I made none. But sometime afterwards an Occasion was made of sending me a Couple of School Books, to state a strong feeling of regret that I had not answered your former Letter, & a hope that I had not taken offence. I supposed that you really were so tender of my feelings that you feared I might have seen omens "of a long, and perplexing Controversy" in the tone and character of your Letter. I therefore wrote you the Letter of June 23d. Not reccollecting whether your appropriate designation, was "Rev." or "Esqr." I stopped in at your Agents to enquire. He told me, that you like myself, had formerly been in the profession of the Law, which gave me a momentary feeling at least of kindness towards you. He further informed me that you were expected in the City that very Evening. I left Compliments for you, and kept my Letter. In the evening you Called, we had a Conversation of an hour, (which by the way you have wholly misrepresented, but of this by and by). In the Course of the Conversation I excused myself for not having sent you a Letter in answer to the particular request, by saying, that I had written one, but learning you were to be in the City had not sent it. At the Close of the Conversation, you said Earnestly, you hoped, notwithstanding the mutual expression of our views, I would give you the Letter I had written. I delivered it to you, we shook hands, and I suppose it was not twenty hours afterward that, in a Public Assembly Collected from all parts of the State; Composed of Gentlemen whose views you supposed to differ from mine on some points of Religion; you advanced Charges wholly untrue, against "The Board of Education" and violated any tie of Confidence between us, by referring to me by name, and proposing to read my

Letter, or Letters to give the Charges Colour. It is proper here, to advert to one passage in your Letter of July 9th where you represent me as saying what I never said, to justify yourself for doing what you had no right to do. You say, "I shall feel myself at liberty still to use the Correspondence, and Conversation between us, on any proper occasion, being assured by your Last Letter, of what I presumed to be the Case, That there is nothing in them, which you have the shadow of a desire to Conceal." In the first place, I said not a word about the "Conversation between us," respecting that, you have not been assured by me as you state. In the next place, you have misquoted me, by omitting a Clause which qualifies the whole Sentence. I said the Letter "Contained nothing which *on any proper occasion for making public,* I had the shadow of a desire to conceal." By omitting the qualification, you give yourself authority to use the Letter, at your own pleasure, whereas it is obvious by the qualifying Clause, that I reserved to myself the right of determining the propriety of the occasion to use it, or, at any rate, I did not submit that point to your discretion—Situated as I am, I maintain for myself the right of private judgement, speech, correspondence, action, as fully as I have ever enjoyed it. But what I say, or write privately to my friends, is not to be made public without my consent, if for no other reason, at least for this, that no man, in the unsuspicious freedom of private intercourse, or correspondence, is careful to invest any Collateral, or balancing view necessary to guard against false imputations. A striking illustration is presented in this very Case. What I said respecting objections which Universalists would urge to "Abbotts Child at Home" if disconnected from your request that I would examine this particular Book, if accompanied by a statement (wholly untrue) that I said generally, and without exception, that the Doctrines of Revealed Religion, could not be safely connected with a course of Public instruction" &c. &c (thus excluding even the Doctrines of Creation, of the existence of an overruling God, of immortality &c. which you very well know, Sir, that I never said to you) and further, if those objections being misstated before a public Assembly, and followed up by a warning Cry, that notwithstanding the great efforts which were making for improvements in "Education" if they could be called so, you feared we might be deluded, and solemn appeals made to "Ministers of the Gospel, and Christian people generally throughout the Commonwealth to see to it,"—I repeat, that with all this garnish, what I said respecting the objections of the

Universalists to that Book, would naturally, and inevitably be misunderstood, and an injurious, false impression made against me. This indeed was done to some extent, and would have been done far more diffusarily, had not The Rev. Mr. Robbins, a member of "The Board of Education" been accidentally present and denied the Charges, and had it not been also shrewdly suspected, by many of the Gentlemen present (I have their personal Authority for saying so) that the prosperous sale of "The American S S Library" which had been paraded upon the Pulpit Stairs of the House where you assembled, entered deeply into the motives which led you to arraign the Conduct of "The Massachusetts Board of Education," and to make my Letters, and private Conversation bear false witness against them—Now had my letter been intended for the public Eye, or Ear, I should have deemed it proper to give an additional illustration of the same principle, in order to prevent misconstruction. I might perhaps have supposed the case of a Universalist, attempting to break in upon the truce which had been established here, with the concurrence of all parties in relation to School Books and endeavoring to foist into our Schools some Universalist work highly offensive to the orthodox part of our community, and I should have said, that such a work would not be tolerated in our Schools. In such Case, no person who had the honesty to quote me fairly, could have excited any suspicion against me. This is only an example of what a Man of Common prudence would have done, had he been addressing the public instead of an individual. You speak of yourself as having taken your ground openly in regard to Controverted Theological opinions, and of being willing to defend it at all times, and places, and you presume I am willing to do the same. Now how is it possible you could overlook the difference in our cases? You are engaged for a society which consists of a part only of the Christian Community. I am engaged for a Body which represents every Religious denomination in the State. Yours is founded upon the plan of propagating your peculiar views, ours upon the plan of non-interference with peculiar views. Allowing that it may be proper for you to attend assemblies of a particular denomination, and there promulgate your notions, it does not follow that it is proper for me to do so. Allowing that it was perfectly proper for you to presume that the Meeting at New Bedford represented a "Majority of the Christian taxpayers of Massachusetts," (in contradistinction I suppose from those taxpayers who are not entitled to be called Christians) still, can you fail to perceive how improper it would be to me

to go to the public Meetings of particular Sects and imitate your example? However consonant such a course may be to your feelings, and your station, it is wholly repugnant to mine. The inference derived from this Source to justify yourself for introducing me, my Correspondence, and Conversation, at that time is therefore wholly unwarranted. I cannot refer with any minuteness to what was done in the Meeting at New Bedford, but I am informed by an Ear witness that one thing was said by you, which I am surprised should have been said, on the view which you now take of the Case. I am also surprised that it should not have been remembered, and stated by you in the account you gave me of the transaction. You profess to give me an Account of the whole Substance of your Remarks, tho not perhaps in the precise Phraseology. Yet I am informed on Authority as Respectable as any in the State, that you declared a wish, "that what you had said in the matter in question might not be carried beyond that assembly, or that no public use might be made of it." My informant justly adds, "But he ought to have Remembered, that what he said there, could not be blotted out so Easy." Now Sir, why after having referred to my Correspondence, and even to my own fireside Conversations, in so public a place, after having ascribed to me opinions, which you supposed would be offensive to them, should you enjoin that secrecy, which if the injunction had been observed, would have withheld from me all knowledge of the attack, and of course deprived me of all opportunity for self defence? Even in the Courts of Rhadamanthus, as described by a heathen, the Victim of injustice is allowed the privilege of vindicating his Character, after receiving Sentence, and punishment. There is one inconsistency running through your Letter of July 9th, which it is proper here to make manifest. An attempt to prove your right to make my Letters, and my fireside Conversations public, and an attempt also to exculpate yourself for having done so. If the first were true, the last would be [un]necessary. You repeatedly refer to the fact, that I had given no express injunctions of Secrecy, and that you were not aware of having assumed any obligations in regard to publicity. Now certainly, this is an entire inversion of the Rule, All Correspondence is Confidential unless special reasons to the contrary appear. No man in writing a private Letter deems it necessary to insert a prohibition against publishing it, or if he ever does, it is only in Cases, where an infraction of the Rule is feared—if nothing appears to take Correspondence out of this Rule, it comes within it, and in doubtful Cases, all presump-

tions, are in favor of the Rule. No such further fact existed in this Case. You, yourself said at N Bedford, at the very moment you were violating this Confidence with your Heart and with your hand, and would have done so with your lips, if Gentlemen had not interfered to prevent it.—You, yourself said, "I presume he had no idea that this Letter would be used for this purpose." In another Sentence of your Letter, you say, "I confess I regretted much the necessity of defending what I had said by a reference to your Letter." Here you own the existence of a *"necessity."* In the same sentence you go on to say, "And I was sorry upon reflection, that I had not said, that as Mr. Robbins remarks had no reference to what I had advanced, I had no occasion to reply." Here after having averred the existence of a "necessity," you were sorry that you had not averred that so far from there being a "necessity" there was not even an "occasion." But even suppose there was, what you Call a "necessity," of making defence, did I bring you into that condition? Why then should you affect an escape from your own perils at my expense? Would it not be considered Base, even in a drowning man, to clutch upon and drown an inoffensive Bystander, to save his own Life? Would not such a Life be stamped with Ignominy from the moment it was saved? In your Letter of July 16th, you desire a very explicit Statement of the points "in which my correspondence with you had been misrepresented, in spirit and object"? Premising that this is "rather a serious offence rather harshly set forth," you ask for the evidence of it, "in the most direct and tangible form?" I cannot agree with you, that the offence is in any degree "harshly set forth," though undoubtedly a "serious one." While a Member of the Profession, you may have heard the saying of Lord Mansfield, that the disclosure of private Correspondence ought to be made, an Indictable offence; and surely it is no mitigation if that correspondence be cruelly perverted, or if the Circumstances material, by way of explaining its origin and Character, be wholly suppressed. But I proceed, according to your request to specify some of the points in which I have been misrepresented, an unwelcome labor I assure you, though abundantly easy. In the first place in your long Letter written after your attack upon The Board, at New Bedford, you change the entire ground upon which our Correspondence had before proceeded. That correspondence was wholly, of a private, and in no respect of a public Character. Neither of your first three Letters was addressed to me, as "Secretary of The Board of Education" neither in the superscription, nor in the

inside Address. Had that been the case with the 1st & 3d they would have been preserved, and I exceedingly regret that they are lost. That it is not the case with the second, which is the only one of the three of any moment (the others containing private requests only) may be seen on Inspection. I preserved that, not because it was official, but because of its contents. And it is not a little remarkable, that the Letters written to me before the attack upon The Board, were addressed to me in my private Character, while the two written since, the new ground has been taken, are Addressed to me at full length, "Secretary of The Board of Education." It shows that if you had meant to address me in my public capacity in the first three as you profess to do in the two last, you would have added the designation. There is nothing in the Contents of my first two Letters to you giving the Slightest intimation, that they were *public Letters,* or written *officially* by me to you. Every sentence of them, as it seems to me, abounds with indications to the Contrary. You confess, that you said at New Bedford, when you drew my Letter from your pocket Book and was about to Read it, or from it, "I presume," he, "had no idea that his Letter would be used for this purpose," whereupon several Members of that Body started to their feet, (actuated by a honorable impulse towards a Stranger, which found no place in your Breast, after having approached me as a friend) and objected even to be passive Spectators of the violation of Confidence which impended. In yours of July 9th, you say my Letters to you "are not yet placed upon the Societys Files" though one of them had been in your hands more than three Months, again showing that they had not been *Considered public* or Official Letters. Again, if they were official Letters, you would not hesitate I presume to publish them in the News papers, in the same manner as official Documents are always liable to be Published. Yet you now say, you should not do so, without my "leave first had been obtained." Neither in my Letters to you, nor in yours to me, previous to July 9th, is mention made of "The Board of Education." They are not named, nor is there even an recognition of the existence of such a Body. You never asked me the opinion of "The Board" respecting Abbotts "Child at Home" or any other Book. I never intimated to you their opinion. I stated to you, what I believed would be the opinions of "Universalists," of "Unitarians," and of "tens of thousands" of others, but not of "The Board," and notwithstanding what you said at N Bedford, there was not a Syllable in my Correspondence with you, incompatible with the idea

that the whole Board would rejoice if Abbotts "Child at Home," could be introduced into the schools. You inquired of me in substance, whether that Book would be acceptable to our districts. In my reply I endeavored to state, what would be the opinions of large portions of our Community respecting it. But, I did not declare, how far I accorded with, or dissented from them. My answer shows that you did not ask what the opinion of The Board would be. You called the answer "frank," again and again, which you would not have done, if I had evaded your enquiry. What you report Mr. Robbins, as saying was therefore perfectly true, that *"he was sure no person had any authority for making any intimations on the subject."* You had no right therefore to represent me as A Member of The Board, for I was not; nor as speaking in behalf of "The Board," for I did not. To say then, that you could substantiate what you had said, Concerning "the Board" by my Letter, or to intimate that my Letter was proof of the Class of opinions, that was to prevail at The Board of Education was entirely to misrepresent both the spirit, and object of that part of my Correspondence. What you say, of having written a "long official Letter to Gov. Everett," has no relevancy to this Case. I never knew, or heard of that Letter before. I have never expressed an opinion of my own, that Your Library Books were Sectarian, for I am sorry to say, I have not found leisure to read one of the Series. It is observable however, that while you say you endeavored to convince Gov. Everett, "that the Books could not be justly opposed on the ground of Sectarism," you specially recommended the Books to the "General Association of Massachusetts," for the very reason, that they "did illustrate the great Doctrines of the Christian faith." Of Course, "the great doctrines" according to your exposition of that faith. Again, you say in your Letter of the 9th of July, that I had assigned among other reasons, why Abbotts "Child at Home" would not be admitted into our public schools the following, Viz. *"because it inculcated the doctrine of a future State of Rewards, and punishments."* Now Sir, I assigned no such reason. My expression, and my only expression was, that "the Book would be in the highest degree offensive to The Universalists." Many of the Universalists as I suppose believe in a limited future State of rewards and punishments. All, as I suppose, (tho on these questions I confess my Ignorance) believe in a future State of *rewards*. In the passages marked by me, and by you too, in Abbotts "Child at Home" as offensive to that denomination, respecting which you say,

you were "perfectly aware" how offensive they would be; in those passages the eternity of Hell torments is reiteratedly affirmed. I said simply, that such passages would be highly offensive to Universalists, whereupon, you declare, that I said, that the Book would not be admitted "because it inculcated the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments." You say, the second reason assigned by me against the admissibility of the Book was, that it presented the character of "The Deity" in a revolting aspect. Again, I must repeat, I said no such thing. What I did say, and what you must have had before you, when you ventured upon that assertion was, that, "there is scarcely anything in the Book which presents the character of God in an Amiable, and Lovely aspect." I affirmed negatively that there was "scarcely anything," amiable or lovely. You say, I affirmed positively that the Book did present a revolting "character of The Deity." The sentiment in my Letter was such, that in your reply you made the following response to it. "I am sure this ought to be done." Apply this response to the language you have put into my mouth, and you will see how enormously you have misrepresented me. It would read thus, "The character of the Deity ought to be represented in a revolting aspect." I come now Sir, to a part of this case, which it is very painful to speak of, for I feel as tho, not you alone, but our common nature must suffer by its exposure. When I learned that you were coming to the city, I left an invitation for you to call upon me. You came, and introduced yourself. I was happy to see you. You had before declared to me, that you "had no purpose to promote, which was not common to every good Citizen of our Country." I supposed, you called in order to promote some such *common purpose*. I had no suspicion that it was to fill your quiver with Arrows against me, against the Board, against the cause of Education in Massachusetts. I had no suspicion, that what was said in my own Room privately, and in Confidence was so soon to be divulged in a public Assembly. You heard my views without any sign of alarm, or any notice that you should so soon sound one, so that it would reach from one end of the State to the other, among the Members of a particular Religious denomination, though still to be kept from me. You kept your fears fully from me that night, as you requested the Assembly to keep what you said to them, from the Channels which would convey it to me. You say we had a free and full interchange of views for an hour, and that I expressed my views very fully on the *general subject* of Religious Education, and advanced the opinion that the mind of a

child should not be influenced on this subject until its judgement is sufficiently matured, to weigh the Evidence and argument for itself, that the doctrines of Revealed Religion could not be safely connected with a course of public Instruction &c. &c. Now in regard to your first assertion, that we had a "full interchange of views" on topics of such a profound, and inexhaustible character, *in one hour,* I shall say nothing. But allowing that a subject, running in all directions into infinity, can be *"fully"* presented in an *hour* still ought not a prudent Man to doubt whether he can be so perfectly assured of another's views in so brief a space, as to Authorize him to make positive promulgation of them, to the world. Now in Charity I am willing to suppose that it was in part owing to this, that I was so hideously misrepresented by you. I surely am bound to Believe so, as far as I can, for the only other alternative is that you had a private "purpose to promote," one not *Common* to all good Citizens, and that you called on me premeditatedly, to obtain means of impairing the standing of the Board of Education in order to execute the private purpose more readily, and effectually. The next point in the statement above quoted, Conscience, duty, truth, oblige me to meet with an unqualified denial. I never advanced to you, nor to any mortal, the opinion, that the mind of a Child, should not be influenced on Religious Subjects until its judgement is sufficiently matured to weigh the evidence, and Arguments for itself. Such a notion conflicts with my whole theory of the nature, and character of a Child's Soul. What I said was, that "Creeds, the abstruse points, which divide one set of Christians from another," ought not to be taught to children. If on this subject, you misunderstood my principal position, how is it possible you should have mistaken my illustration? I compared the sixty, or eighty hostile Religious Sects into which Christendom is now divided, to the Sixty or Eighty Conflicting astronomical theories which once prevailed. I said, that had I lived in those times and been intrusted with the Education of Children, in the Branch of Astronomy, I would never have declared to them, that all the motions of the Heavenly Bodies were infallibly known by me, that I was positively Right while all my Contemporaries were as positively wrong, (that was the Spirit that imprisoned Galileo for discovering the truth), but that I would deeply have indoctrinated my Pupils in Natural and Mechanical Science, in Mathematics, and in Geometry, and then I would have laid open the sixty or Eighty theories and left them with their better trained and more impartial Minds to make their own selection, with a thousand times

better chance of arriving at the truth than I had ever enjoyed. Had not this course been pursued in regard to Astronomy, no doubt we should not have had the Copernican System to this day. Such was my illustration, and my conclusion was, that the Religion of Heaven should be taught to children, while the creeds of men should be postponed until their Minds were sufficiently matured to weigh Evidence, and Arguments. Your next assertion, that I said, *generally, and without exception,* that "the doctrines of revealed Religion, could not be safely connected with a Course of Public Instruction," is too erroneous to be credited a moment by any one. Thus Sir I might go on with as many pages more, as I have already filled, demonstrating *in "direct and tangible form"* that the Remaining points in your Statement, are in character like the preceding. But I am weary, and sick of the painful task, while I am writing, it seems to me there is a severity in the mere statement of the facts and the comparison with each other, of your acts, and declarations, that is liable to be mistaken for a severity in my manner of exhibiting them. I will therefore draw this long Letter to a close, postponing the residue—I hope forever, at least until some new occasion shall arise for renewing its examination. I have the less reason for pursuing the subject at this time, because I am informed by Gentlemen who were present that your obvious motives in behalf of your "Library" very much impaired the force of your attack upon the Board, on account of the apparent, and intimate connection, which the last had to the first—that of an effect to its cause. One Gentleman, than whom a milder man was not to be found in that Assembly, after stating to me how "indignant" he felt at your "Offensive Remarks" proceeds as follows, "The Community, so far as I know, have full Confidence in the Abilities and motives of The Board, and especially of their Secretary. As to the Character of the Books I find no Committees who want any party Religion in them, or anything sectarian. We want the cardinal virtues as you have well expressed in your Report (pp. 62-65)." In reference to the future public use of my correspondence, which you will have it in your power to make, and which you say you shall feel at liberty to do *on any proper occasion,* I have one word to say. The Letters were sent you under the universally implied injunction as to publicity, though what you have done absolves me from all obligations to keep the correspondence private, it does not confer that right upon you. But one thing, let me warn you not to do, not to make the most public use of my Letters and Conversations, in order "to Combat them,

yourself, or so that others may Combat them," and then enjoin secrecy, so that I may never hear of it. One thing also in your own view of the subject, I feel bound to notice, while you intimate strongly that it may be your pleasure, and your duty to make known publicly the erroneous views you ascribe to me, you at the same time say, that you "shall not feel at liberty to publish my Letters in the Newspapers, without my leave first had been obtained." Now I am utterly unable to discern any cause for this distinction, except that which led you to enjoin Secrecy on the Meeting at New Bedford. What valid distinction can be made between what you have already done, and the Case of conceded wrong by a Newspaper Publication? except indeed, it be a distinction in favor of the latter. You go into a large Assembly, presumed by you to represent "a majority of the Christian taxpayers of Massachusetts," you ascribe certain opinions, and designs to me, and to the "Board," you take a Letter from your pocketbook, & would have read from it, but for the intervention of others. You "Converse freely with your colleagues, and Members of the Board" of Your Society,—A Society, which in addition to the usual Complement of President, and Secretaries, has thirty six Managers, and Publishers, a List of Thirty five vice Presidents, and has I believe Agents in every State of the Union; You avow, that you shall feel at liberty to use not only my Correspondence but my private Conversations *publicly*, hereafter, and yet you affect a delicacy in regard to Publishing me in the Newspapers, where Misrepresentations could be confuted, and where no injunctions of secrecy could avail! I have been informed by one distinguished Member of the Association at New Bedford, that you there asserted, as he understood you, that I was opposed even to the inculcation of the belief of a General Providence, and by another Member of the same Body, that you were understood to specify another doctrine deemed fundamental by the Calvinists, as Repudiated by me. I am disposed, however, to believe, inasmuch as the assurance in neither of these cases was positive, that there is a mistake in each. But do not these facts show, how liable to give erroneous impressions, even if motives were perfectly honest, was the course you adopted? And Now, Sir, at least for the present I take my leave of you. In doing so, I must say, that sadness preponderates over all other feelings. Your course of treatment towards me, personally, has been well fitted to kindle resentment. This however, if not so already will soon be allayed. But you have attempted to sow the seeds of prejudice against the Sacred Cause of Education, as administered in

this State. Some of these Seeds are now undoubtedly growing. You have attacked The Board of Education, a Board enjoying in a very high degree the confidence of their fellow Citizens, A Board, at whose head, is the accomplished Governor of this Commonwealth, A Gentleman, who has rendered perhaps, as much service to the Literature of this Country, as any other person, and who has already enriched our Language, with as Beautiful models of taste in Composition, as are to be found in its whole Compass. Another Gentleman, on that Board is known both in Europe, and America for his invaluable services in Collecting the works, and illustrating the History of the greatest Men, who have shed luster upon the human Race. Another Member of that Board, has lately shown the sincerity of his desires to improve the general intelligence, and virtue of the people, by A Gift of the sum of Ten Thousand Dollars, in aid of those objects. Two other Gentlemen, of great worth and attainments are on the Board, who are Clergymen, and belong to that very Class, of Ministers, whom you so earnestly appealed to at New Bedford, I mean the Class of Christians Commonly Called Orthodox. But I need not particularize. All are Men selected for their talents, and for the favor with which they were regarded by large portions of our Community. Yet these are the Gentlemen, whom you undertake to arraign, and Condemn, you speak most Contemptuously of their services, and efforts, you fear, that notwithstanding, the hopes that have been fostered by their enlightened exertions in the cause of Education, *You fear,* that we may be "deluded." *"Improvements, if they may be called so,"* is the Language you use in reference to the measures they have adopted, and what Cause of denunciation have you against this Board, except that they will not aid, as you suppose, in the propagation of your dogmas, and the sale of your Library? Surely the tribunal which has jurisdiction of this part of your "offence" ought before passing sentence, to enquire into your sanity.

Yours Respectfully,

(Signed) Horace Mann

P.S. I shall go out of the city in the morning. I shall leave this Letter in the hands of a friend to be copied, and it will be forwarded to you by the first opportunity. H.M.

No. 11

Philadelphia Sept. 19 1838

Hon. Horace Mann
Boston, Mass
Dr. Sir,

Your communication of July 26th was not received till Sept. 5th.

As between ourselves I should not think of replying to *such a letter;* but as the subject-matter is of general interest, and as our respective relations to it may be of interest to our respective friends, I feel bound, at least, to deny what you mis-state & to explain what you profess to mis-understand. You are at liberty, of course, to drop the *correspondence* when & where you please. Of the *subject* however it will not be so easy to dispose. It is a matter of very little consequence comparatively what becomes of me, or even of you & your official station; but it is a matter of inconceivable consequence whether such views as you hold, or such as I hold, shall prevail in a system of public instruction about to be established in Massachusetts. This point will be discussed, I think, with some freedom & for some time.

That you should wish to avoid the discussion is not surprising. The monstrous construction you put upon the statute prohibiting "the purchase or use, in any of the town schools, of any *school books* which are calculated to favour the tenets of any particular sect of Christians," whereby you think authority is given to *exclude all religious teaching*—would soon be exploded;—Your avowed theory which makes natural religion & ethics the basis of the system would be set aside before it had gained a foothold, & the people of the Puritan State would drive you back upon the Bible & the precepts & principles of *revealed religion,* as the true & only basis of such a system—The *law itself* is wise, wholesome, necessary;—but *your interpretation of it* would be pronounced forced,—mischievous,—absurd.

In your letter of July 5 you were pleased to set forth my offence in form following—viz.—"That at the meeting of the General Asso-"ciation of Massachusetts &c I stated among other things that the "Board of Education in this State (meaning Massachusetts) would "recommend books for schools that were anti-evangelical; and that "after the correctness of this statement had been explicitly denied by "a member of the Board, who alleged facts proving its utter ground-"lessness, that I then held up a letter, said it was from Mr. Mann, "and that it would sustain the charge I had made." This charge you

have never attempted to sustain & probably never will attempt it—It is necessary, however, to put it out of the way—at least by an explicit denial of every sentence & syllable of it—I did not say "that the Board of Education in Massachusetts would recommend anti-evangelical books." Of course I did not propose or attempt to prove what I never asserted or dreamed of asserting—nor do I believe that any respectable person has said, or will say that he ever heard this statement, or anything substantially like it from my lips. If it is shown that I did say so, I will submit patiently to the abusive language you have employed in your letter of the 22d of July & forever after hold my peace.

I admit that if such a statement was made, as you repeatedly charge me with making—it would be "utterly false" & would be "followed with grievous consequences if the slightest credence were given to it," and the same might be said of an hundred other supposed falsehoods—I wish you to understand distinctly at the outset that I have never uttered a word or thought respecting the opinions of the Board of Education—I never asked you for their opinion of any book or any measure; and there was nothing in all I said at New Bedford "incompatible with the idea that the whole Board would rejoice if Abbott's Child at Home could be introduced into the Schools." What should induce you to deny so stoutly & repeatedly what was never alleged, I cannot imagine.

Again, I did not represent you (I think) as a member of the Board; certainly not as speaking in behalf of the Board—and as I said nothing about the opinions of the Board, I had nothing to substantiate—I did say, & do now say, that your letters would prove what *your* opinions are as to one class of books, & as to the question whether they will or will not be tolerated in the public schools of Massachusetts;—& that *if* those opinions are to prevail at the Board, it is time good men & especially ministers of the Gospel should see to it.

I have said that you have never attempted to sustain the charge you made against me in your letter of July 5 & that you probably never will attempt it—Will you inform me on whose authority it was made?

Upon your invitation contained in that letter I gave you a simple account of what was said & done at New Bedford—and you now complain that I have wronged you in two particulars,

1st By abusing your confidence &
2dly By misrepresenting your views & opinions—

As to the first point, it is enough (for the present at least) that I should simply deny the charge—Your letters to me were never (to my knowledge) made the ground of an assault upon, nor the cause of alarm to, the Board of Education, nor was that Board ever arraigned by me at any bar for any purpose. All this is a sketch of fancy as any one will tell you who heard what was said & saw what was done.

The use of the letter, which I chanced to have with me (having received it on my way to New Bedford), was purely accidental, undesigned & unpremeditated. The first thought of using it & the proposition to use it, were simultaneous—One of your Board was understood by some to deny (at least by implication) what I had stated. This made it necessary for me to repeat what I had said & to say at the same time, that I was prepared to prove it if it was denied —*It was not denied,* but on the contrary was confirmed by a member of the Association from his personal knowledge—& of course the offered evidence was dispensed with.

You seem to attach much importance to the remark I made when I alluded to your letter—viz. "that I presumed you did not expect it would be used for that purpose." For what purpose? Why simply to sustain an assertion which one of your closest official connexions was supposed to deny. I made a statement respecting the opinions of the Secretary of the Board of Education. A member of the Board replies, and is understood to question the correctness of my statement, or to deny that there is any authority for it—I offer the only evidence I have in my reach, to show that my statement is correct & that I have authority for making it—The fact that you did not expect that letter to be used on that occasion & for that purpose (to silence a member of the Board), has nothing to do with the *right or propriety* of so using it.

Though it is of no sort of consequence to the merits of this controversy, that any such change took place, as you allege, in my style of addressing you before & after the meeting at New Bedford, still I feel constrained to assure you that I am not conscious of having made any such change, nor of any reason or motive for so doing. You assume the fact simply because you did not see fit to preserve the letters, which you think you should most certainly have done if they had been official, & then you use the fact, *thus assumed,* to set off the forethought & deliberation (not to say ingenuity) with which I executed my nefarious plan to destroy you, & the Board of Education &c &c.— You admit in the same breath that you preserved one of my letters,

though not officially addressed for special reasons. Your practice therefore is not uniform & the weight of evidence derived from that quarter is materially reduced.

You say without any qualification that "official documents are always liable to be published in the newspapers," and as I acknowledge I did not feel authorized so to publish them, I could not have regarded them as official—I cannot admit the correctness of this reasoning—I have many official letters which have never been on the Society's files, some of which are a year old & upwards—& though strictly official, I should not think of publishing them in the newspapers without the consent of the writers—and moreover, I might be perfectly authorized to quote an opinion from any one of them, in the very words of the author, on many (even public) occasions, though I might not be warranted in publishing the letter itself in the newspapers. I will illustrate my views of this branch of the subject, by a supposed parallel case.

I am a Congregationalist—In the Society which employs me, are members of the Methodist, Baptist, Episcopalian, Presbyterian & other (orthodox) denominations—They have associated upon the principle that while the peculiarities which distinguish them from each other shall not be known through the Society's publications, the general system of doctrines known as orthodox or evangelical shall be fully & distinctly urged. As Editor of these publications I must be able to exert no inconsiderable influence in determining their general character &c.—This I could do in the correspondence with authors & publishers *& in my official connexion with the Committee, on whom rests the whole ultimate responsibility.*

Now it would be a matter of some interest to the Board & the members of the Society & indeed of the *friends of the cause generally,* that my views & principles should in the main accord with theirs. Suppose under these circumstances, Rev. Mr. Blagden of the Old South, should address a letter to me, asking my opinion of "Abbott's Child at Home" as a Sunday School Library book—and I should reply that it was decidedly objectionable because, among other things, it inculcates the doctrines of natural depravity, regeneration, and the divinity of Christ, each & all of which I believe to be dogmas—inventions of men—a part of "human creeds" unsanctioned by the "religion of heaven"—Suppose I should then proceed to speak of other books & other views & to lay open to Mr. Blagden my whole theory on this subject, or at least enough of it to show him what its charac-

teristics would be.—I cannot believe that Mr. Blagden would do right to publish this letter in the newspapers without my consent, but on the other hand I cannot doubt, that if he should be making a speech at a Sunday School anniversary in Boston, in which it should become necessary to speak of the Am. S.S. Union he might say, without just cause of offence to me or any one else: "I was once friendly to the Am. S.S. Union. I am still so; though my confidence has been shaken, & I feel some anxiety lest its power may be abused or perverted.—The circulation of their books is very general & exerts a mighty influence on the most precious interests of our children & youth—And I have reason to believe that the officer, charged with the oversight of this particular department, entertains views (specifying them) essentially different from, if not directly opposite to those which the friends & patrons of the Society would wish to have diffused, and if the Board & especially the Committee of publication (with which the Editor is most closely connected) are likely to sanction these views, or even to afford an opportunity for their silent introduction into our Sabbath Schools, it is high time the friends of those schools & the friends of Scriptural truth generally should look to it—"

And suppose (to run the parallel out) that some member of our Board should chance to be present and to follow Mr. Blagden by saying that he was officially cognizant of the facts in this case—that no one had any authority to say or to intimate that such views as had been presented, prevailed at the Board or that any views at all prevailed there—To all which Mr. Blagden replies, that he had never attributed such views to the Board but only to an officer of the Board & that if the impression was designed to be made that those views were not entertained by that officer, he was prepared to substantiate it by a document from his own hand, which he should feel perfectly justified in using for that purpose, although it was not probably prepared or intended to be so used. If there is any material difference between your grievance, & that which I should suffer in the supposed case it must be merely nominal.

But what is the true aspect of the *real* case? You hold the office (virtually) of Minister of public instruction—As the head of this department your opinion has much weight. To *"test your opinion"* on the general subject of reading, or library books for the public schools of Massachusetts,—I selected a volume which I informed you had been introduced into a District School Library (strictly so called) in the State of New York, and asked your opinion of it.—I

put on no guise.—I used no arts to lure you into a correspondence.—I simply asked *you*—the Secretary of the Board of Education—whether Abbott's "Child at Home" would be admitted into the District School Libraries of Massachusetts? And in reply you said "without a moment's hesitation, that it would not be tolerated in Massachusetts as a District School Library book." This was all I asked & all I expected—But you "took the liberty" (and I was more than willing you should) to give your reasons for this opinion, and, I confess they surprised me, and I think they would surprise a majority of the tax-paying Christians of Massachusetts.—Let us look at them.

The first reason you assign why this book would not be tolerated &c is, that it contains certain passages which would be offensive to a particular class of persons because they inculcate the doctrine or idea that the wicked will be eternally punished in a future world.—I have said, & say again & shall continue to say that your objection to this book is, in truth & in fact, that it teaches the *doctrine of a future state of rewards & punishments*. No attempt to escape from this construction will succeed—Mark well—that I never intimated publickly or privately that the Board of Education objected to this or any other book for this or any other reason; or that they would not rejoice to see the Child at Home introduced into all the Schools—It is *your* opinion that was sought & given—And did you not mean to be understood that a District School Library book, which should inculcate the doctrine of a future state of rewards & punishments, in the usual acceptation of that phrase, would not (for that reason) be tolerated in Massachusetts?—You would not, I am sure, resort to a paltry quibble to relieve yourself of embarrassment. You "do not hesitate a moment to say that 'Abbotts Child at Home' would not be tolerated in Massachusetts as a District School Library book"—Why? Because of certain passages on pages 13 & 28. Why should those passages exclude it? "Because they would be offensive to the Universalists"—Why would they offend the Universalists? "Because they inculcate a doctrine which the Universalists reject & to which they are so opposed that they would rather see the whole system of public instruction abolished, than to have a book inculcating that doctrine introduced into the schools"—And what is that doctrine? Why that the finally impenitent will be eternally punished—Of course any other book inculcating that doctrine would be alike rejected—Well, but (you inquire) might not a book be endured which inculcates the doctrine of *limited* punishment—or the doctrine of *rewards*

only—And if so, what truth or justice is there in saying that the objection is to the doctrine of a future state of *rewards & punishments,* when it is in fact only to a future state of *eternal* punishment—I reply that the great mass of Universalists reject the doctrine of future punishment;—and to inculcate the doctrine of *rewards only* would offend all but Universalists & infidels—This you could not have contemplated.—That your objection concerned not the *eternity* of punishment, but the general doctrine of punishments & rewards, I think I shall be able to show conclusively by & by. I think I have already shown that I did not misrepresent what must have been the true intent & meaning of your objection.

Again: A book is published which professes to present the character of God to the minds of children—Your opinion is that it does not present the character of God in an amiable or lovely aspect, (in which light I agree with you that it ought to be presented); & that for this reason, it would not be tolerated in Massachusetts. The whole scope of your objection is that the character of God as presented in the book is not calculated to excite love—If it excites any emotion at all, then, it must be the opposite of love—It must be an *unlovely* aspect & Johnson tells us, (speaking strictly as a lexicographer) that "by the word *unlovely* something more seems intended than bare negation"—I am persuaded that a little reflection will lead you to retract this charge—or to see, at any rate, that my representation of your views on this point, was not inconsistent with truth & justice—Your paraphrase of my language, in this connexion, for the purpose of illustrating a supposed inconsistency must have been framed without regard to the rules of rhetoric or propriety.

Again—Did we have "a full interchange of views for one hour" at your rooms in Boston?—I think we did & said so. You think we did not. Perhaps it was not quite an hour—Perhaps you had much more to say—But whether it was a "full interchange of views" or not, each of us is competent to judge for himself.—I believe I fully understood such views as you did express. How you might have amplified or modified them, if I had stayed an hour or a week longer I cannot say—The views I represented you as holding were fully & distinctly expressed during our interview, and I could not possibly have any "private purpose or motive" for misrepresenting them. You would think it very unkind & uncourteous (and I should think it very unchristian) for me to impute to you such motives, in wishing to conceal your opinions from those who certainly ought to know them.

I re-affirm the statement which you deny respecting the postponement of religious instruction beyond the period of childhood—You did say to me in substance, if not *in todidem verbis,* that the mind should be left to judge of religious doctrines for itself & that no influence should be used to bias it on religious subjects, until the judgement is sufficiently matured to weigh the evidence & arguments for itself. You admit that you said that "creeds & abstruse points which divide one sect of Christians from another" ought not to be taught to children—and when you will enumerate these creeds & points it will be found (as I found it) that they embrace any & all points of faith on which any one person in Christendom differs from any other person in Christendom.

You used the illustration about the systems of astronomy—Be assured I neither mistook nor misunderstood it. And I well remember saying in reply that the illustration was entirely inappropriate, inasmuch as the adoption or rejection of either of those systems involved no such infinite consequences as the adoption or rejection of a plain doctrine of Christianity; and I equally well remember asking you what you would say to your own child who should address you thus:

"Father, I read in the Bible that the wicked shall be turned into hell & all the nations that forget God; and again that the wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment but the righteous into life eternal; and yet I heard Mr. say that there is no hell except that which is endured in this life, and that it is a reproach to God's character to suppose that he is so unmerciful as to punish us forever for the sins of a few short years."

Would you not tell the child what your own views were; why you held them; & why you thought the opposite views unsound & unscriptural?—You replied emphatically: "No; I would state the different opinions & the grounds of them so far as I knew them, and leave the child's mind to form its own conclusions!"

On this subject you admit, as I said before, all I wish to show & fully establish all my representations. "The *religion of heaven*" should be taught to children, say you, but the "creeds of men" should be postponed until their minds &c.

And pray who but men are to determine what is "the religion of heaven"? Does it include the holiness of God, the corruption of the human heart—the sacrifice of Christ for sin—the eternal punishment of the finally impenitent &c. &c.? No, you will say, these belong to the "creeds of men" & must be postponed until the pupil's mind is

sufficiently matured to weigh evidence & argument. The "religion of heaven" you will say "is a religion common to all—Its doctrines are revealed in the skies & the flowers, in the ocean & the landscape—These, children can understand—There is nothing in them to confuse & perplex & divide their innocent minds." I know, but imperfectly the principles of this philosophy, but I trust they are too well known in Massachusetts to be long current, unless they are secretly propagated, under official influence, without awakening suspicion.

I am surprised, beyond measure, that you should deny one of your statements, viz. "That the doctrines of revealed religion cannot be safely connected with a course of public instruction"—You certainly made it, more than once, during our conversation. Allow me to ask—Are not the doctrines of revealed religion those which divide Christendom into its "sixty or eighty hostile religious sects," as you express it?—& to keep out these hostile religious creeds from the public schools of Massachusetts, do you not require *all religious teaching* to be excluded? And "among the vast libraries of books expository of these doctrines have you been able to find one solitary volume which the law (as you expound it) does not exclude from the public schools?"—Surely it would be very inconsistent for you, now, in the face of all this to hold that the doctrines of revealed religion *can be* safely connected with a system of public instruction.

I would ask again—what "doctrines of revealed religion" will remain, to be connected with a system of public instruction, after subtracting those about which there are conflicting creeds among men; which you still admit ought not to be taught to children. You will be surprised, I think to see the position in which you have placed yourself on this point. So far from my assertion being too enormous to be credited by any one, your denial of it must lead you into a labyrinth of inconsistencies & contradictions from which you would find it impossible to extricate yourself.

No, Sir; the simple truth is disclosed in your report & it will finally be seen in your operations—that your theory of public instruction excludes the doctrines of revealed religion & sends the pupil to the religion of nature as it is called—or to the religion of Socrates & Plato, to learn his origin, character & destiny.

I wish you had gone on to specify my supposed misrepresentations, as I could have shown you that they were all as utterly imaginary as those you have set forth—Upon recurring to your letter, I perceive there is one other topic of complaint to which I feel constrained to

advert—It will appear most strikingly if placed in the form of parallel passages—

You said	*I said*
"I have not the slightest objection to your retaining a copy of the letter, if you choose, as it contains nothing, which, on any proper occasion for making public, I have the shadow of a desire to conceal"—	"I send you the original letter as you request, retaining a copy (certified). I shall feel at liberty still to use the correspondence & conversation between us on any proper occasion, publickly; being assured by your last letter, of what I presumed to be the case before, that there is nothing in them which you have the shadow of a desire to conceal."

You complain that I extend your license to the conversation as well as to the letters—The "conversation" I concede was not covered by the license, and I may not have occasion to use it. But I must protest against your *restriction* of the other branch of the license—To tell a man he may do a thing, *whenever you choose to have him do it*, can hardly be called a license. There is nothing in the letters which you have the shadow of a desire to conceal, *but* nothing in them is to be made public *unless you shall first decide* that the occasion is proper! Now I humbly conceive, that I am to judge of the propriety of the occasion, & if I misjudge, & disclose their contents on an *improper* occasion, you have good right to complain & I must abide the consequences.

Before I dismiss the topic of misrepresentations I beg to call your attention to a passage in your letter of July 22. It is as follows—"You speak of yourself (meaning me) as having taken your ground openly in regard to controverted theological opinions & of being willing to defend it at all times & places & you presume I (meaning yourself) am willing to do the same." Now I do not complain of this as a misrepresentation, or perversion of my language; but I call your attention to it as a perfectly gratuitous assertion without the shadow of authority.—You might with equal propriety assert that I speak of myself as having been one of the eight persons who were saved with Noah in the ark—I certainly have the advantage of you in this respect, according to your own showing, for my supposed misrepresentations had some relation to something which had passed between us, but the statement which you ascribe to me cannot claim even that.—This passage of your letter was probably written in haste & under excitement.

You cite the opinions of several members of the Association at New Bedford, as expressed to you for the purpose of showing that my course on that occasion was not approved.—I could cite an equal (& perhaps even larger) number of opinions of a directly opposite character & we shall then stand just where we do now. As this is probably the last communication I shall find it necessary to make to you on this subject, I will ask your indulgence briefly to recapitulate the prominent points we have discussed.

I have evidence in my possession that the subject of introducing our library into the public schools of Massachusetts was considered in the Board of Education before our correspondence commenced; & that it was objected to as *sectarian,* because some of the books inculcate or imply the doctrine of the Trinity—I have no reason to doubt, but every reason to presume, that you were present & participated in that discussion—The subject was before you.

Every good citizen of the country—certainly every good citizen of Massachusetts has a common interest & purpose in ascertaining, whether the Christian religion, as revealed in the Old & New Testaments, is to be recognized as the basis of public instruction—My opinion was & still is, that it will not be so recognized by the Board of Education of which you are Secretary.

To inform myself on the subject & to ascertain, first of all, your views which I presumed would have great weight with the Board & the community—I proposed the "Child at Home" as a *test* of your opinions—Of this I gave you notice in my letter of March 28th. I did not ask you to tell me the reasons of your opinions, nor to commit yourself in any way or form—But you volunteered an expression of your views & it fully confirmed the opinion I had previously formed, that, so far as your influence is concerned—*the Christian religion will not be recognized as the basis of the system of public instruction in Massachusetts.*

After this I sent you some of our library books—selecting those which would furnish the fairest specimen of their general character—and requested your opinion of them, but you have had no time to examine them. At a subsequent period I sent you a copy of two elementary books published by the Society—Did I ask your opinion of them? In relation to one of them (the Spelling book) you decide peremptorily that it would be excluded from the schools in Massachusetts—It is inadmissible. Why? because of certain passages which you specify. And what are they? Do they teach the *eternity of hell-*

torments, which was the crying sin of the "Child at Home"?—Not at all. One of them teaches "that Adam and Eve sinned & were punished; —that all their descendants have been wicked; that sin is the cause of all the sickness, pain & death that afflict the world; that Christ came in the flesh & died upon the cross to redeem men from their sins;—that the place to which the good go after death is the place where God is & where all is pure;—while the place to which the wicked go, is the place where sin is & where nothing is pure"—

Now what you can find in all this that ought to exclude this book from the public schools in Massachusetts I cannot conceive, unless it is that it alludes to the doctrines of the *Christian religion—which is not to be recognized as the basis of public instruction in Massachusetts.*

You then proceed to give your own opinion of another feature of the book to which you would object *still more strenuously* than to those passages which are *sufficiently objectionable* to exclude them from your public schools. *"For my own part I should object still more strenuously* &c." This I take to be *an opinion of your own, in contradistinction from the one you had just before expressed.* And whose was that other opinion? *On whose part* would the other objection be urged which you think less formidable, than the one which you have *on your part?* Do you not see the dilemma in which you place yourself?—But aside from all this—what is that to which you *"for your part,"* so *"strenuously object";* which you regard "as the most dangerous of all teaching, tending more than *anything else,* to unsettle all sound notions respecting the constitution of the system in which we are placed" &c. A grave charge, truly! A religious benevolent society, circulating 500 or 600 different publications over the land—having in its connexion upwards of fifty thousand teachers & upwards of half a million of children & youth, and yet lending itself to the most dangerous of all teaching, unsettling all sound notions &c.—Let them be exposed & put down at once & if they are guilty of the charge you have brought against them, all the people will say, Amen, to their condemnation & extermination. But what is this mischievous lesson or passage? Why it is *one in which the common events of life are referred to divine interposition!* These are your words, and I understand from them, as well as from the conversation we had on that topic,—Within the hour—(in which you may remember *Carlisle's* name was introduced by you) that you regard the providence of God as extending no farther than to a general superintendence of the laws

of Nature, and as not interposing in the particular concerns of individuals—

Nothing could be wanting, beyond this, firmly to establish my convictions *that the Christian religion is not likely to be recognized as the basis of the system of public instruction in Massachusetts.*

And with these convictions, which I attempted to show were well-grounded, I did call on the good people whom I addressed at New Bedford to investigate the matter—I *said* nothing,—I *intimated* nothing,—I *knew* nothing respecting the views of the Board of Education. When you speak of my "attacking," "arraigning," "condemning," "denouncing," & "speaking contemptuously" of them—I must suppose it to be for effect, for it is most certainly the creation of your own fancy—You will find, on calm examination, that it has not a shade of truth.

You eulogize the Board & the deeds of benevolence done by several of its members—I fully respond to all this, but it is entirely irrelevant to the subject. All my proceedings & purposes have relation to *you* & not to them—It is *your* views, not *theirs* which our discussion has concerned.

You say I have "no cause of denunciation against the Board except that they will not aid (as I suppose) in carrying out my dogmas & in selling my library"! I say again I have denounced nobody—You must be aware, on reflection, that this is all unjust & untrue—As the representative of a publishing house, I respectfully asked *your* opinion as to the probability that a certain class of books would be circulated in the public schools of Massachusetts, submitting a specimen for your examination. You—the minister of public instruction in that State—decided that they would not be tolerated—& gave your reasons—In doing so you disclosed views on the subject of public education *which I cannot but deem erroneous, unphilosophical, dangerous & corrupt.* Your official connexion with the Board of Education, seemed to me to make the entertainment of these views by you a matter of momentous interest, which none but an infinite mind can comprehend. If they should become incorporated with the system of instruction about to be established, *under your auspices,* on a firm and durable basis, I cannot doubt that the most sacred institutions & usages of my native State would be uprooted & abolished—And do you think I am bound to hold my peace in such circumstances—Shall I see an incendiary, with torch in hand, approaching the garner in which are deposited the cherished blessings & hopes of many generations, & when he whispers

his design to me, shall I not give the alarm—If he is innocent—if he has no such design—if the alarm is groundless, let the responsibility be on me—I mean nothing harsh or unkind by the illustration I use—I would only illustrate my own convictions of the true bearings of the case.

Are you willing that the people of Massachusetts should know your views on the subjects we have discussed, so far as they relate to the *books & principles of teaching* which you would admit or reject? Or do you prefer to conceal those views until you have secured their introduction into the system of public instruction, which an abused & deceived community will then be expected to sustain?

"The great idea," which seems to fill your mind, "that those points of doctrine upon which good & great men differ shall not be obtruded into this neutral ground of the schools," is a grand instrument in the hands of freethinkers, atheists & infidels for the accomplishment of their purposes. They would shut out every ray of light from the Bible. But there is another "great idea"—viz. that a book may illustrate the prominent doctrines of the Christian faith & still not be objectionable on account of sectarism—This idea you will find is & has been held, by men of the most enlightened & elevated minds. Of course the inconsistency which you so imposingly describe, must be charged to them as well as to me.

Jefferson & Franklin are often called great & good men, but they differed, you know from other great & good men, in rejecting the Christian religion. Of course the Christian religion is not to be "obtruded on the neutral ground of the schools"—Why not speak out then. Avow your principles—Let the whole Board of Education know what you think—Let them adopt or reject, countenance or condemn your opinions & not send you forth as their accredited agent, concealing in your bosom principles & plans of *official* labour which, if disclosed, would destroy the confidence of a large portion of the people in you & in them.

Respectfully Yours &c

(Signed) Fred A Packard

P.S. If any portion of our correspondence has been made known, in any form, to the Board of Education or if they have been made acquainted with the subject matter of it, officially or otherwise, I may be excused for requesting that this, my answer to your various

charges & allegations may be laid before them, at the first convenient opportunity.—I have personal friends at the Board whom, I should regret to have left under the impressions which your statements, uncontradicted & unexplained, might leave upon their minds—While I would avoid making myself conspicuous in such a discussion, I would not shrink from the publicity & defence of all that I have done & said.—

F.A.P.

Appendix B

Letters from Thomas Robbins and Enoch Sanford to Horace Mann

Mattapoisett, Rochester,
June 30th, 38.

Hon. Mr. Mann,
Dear Sir.

Your favour of the 24th inst. came to hand three days ago. I regret to hear of your having been indisposed. I pray you, for the sake of your friends & the public, to pay a primary regard to your health. About which I have not been without anxiety. . . .

The Gen. Association of Mass. have held their annual meeting this week at New Bedford. Among other Agents that asked & obtained leave to address the Body, was Mr. Packard, in behalf of the Amer. Sab. Sch. Union at Philadelphia. He took occasion to state that the Board of Education of this State would recommend Books for Schools that were anti-Evangelical. I believe this is the amount of his assertion. Unfortunately, as I was but a Lobby member, & could not have anticipated such an impropriety, I was out at the time of his speaking. As I came in Dr. Fay of Charlestown asked me if I heard "the attack on the Board of Education?" He told me what it was. I asked permission to reply; & being sustained by your friend Mr. Sanford of Raynham & others, it was given. I stated to the Body that the Board of Education had not yet decided, definitively, on any books for the use of Schools; still less had decided against any, that they had voted to introduce no book without unanimous consent; that they felt that

they were acting in behalf of the Legislature, & the people, all the people of the Commonwealth; that they felt deeply the importance of books as classics & for libraries; & that I indulged a hope that no one would proclaim by anticipation what books the Board would or would not recommend. The man held up a letter, said it was from Mr. Mann & would sustain what he said. They promptly refused to hear it. He had said that he supposed Mr. Mann had no expectation that it would be made public. Several of the members told me that what I said was sufficient & would do away the impression that he had made. I believe Mr Packard is an indifferent character. He makes Mr. Bullard a great deal of trouble. Mr. B. is Secretary of the Mass. Sab. Sch. Union, an excellent man, whom I should like to have you know— . . . Your friend and fellow-laborer in the common cause.—Single men have usually done the most in the cause of Education. Thomas Robbins.

Raynham, 13 July 1838.

Mr. H. Mann,

Dear Sir,

I received your letter but yesterday.—I should not think it strange if you felt a little moved by the occurrence alluded to in your letter. Mr. F. A. Packard agent for the American S. School Union was quite unfortunate in some of his remarks before the Association. His object seems to be to recommend the books of that Union more generally in N. England, both for Sabbath School & common school libraries. His objectionable remarks were in substance these, that from information he had obtained, it was evident the Board of Education would recommend no books for our schools which were decidedly of an evangelical character; books which inculcate the idea or doctrine of a future retribution would be rejected by the Board. My impression is that he also instanced one other truth, regeneration as understood by most christians which would be studiously discarded. He also stated that Abbot's [*sic*] "Child at Home" would not be admitted into the school libraries,—that a member of the Board had informed him, that it would not, because of its peculiarly evangelical character. At his saying that the influence of Ministers in regard to the schools was on the wane I care nothing; but at the above remarks I felt a little indignant, & immediately rose & looked round to see if Mr. Robins [*sic*] was in the church. He had just stepped out. It was not a meeting that afternoon for public worship, but for hearing addresses from agents of different Benevolent Societies. As soon as Mr. Robins came

in I informed him of what had been said, & I asked leave of the Moderator for Mr. Robins to make a few remarks. It being granted, he denied the charges, stated that he knew not by what authority they were made;—that the Board had not decided what books to recommend:—that when they should decide, he had no doubt they would be such as would be approved by the community in general. Mr. Packard rose to explain,—said he could substantiate, if permitted, what he had said, by reading from a letter which he had received, some time since, from the Secretary of the Board of Education, holding it then in his hand, (as I suppose). Several members, one after another, objected to his reading, & the Moderator Dr. Snell of N. Brookfield observed it would not be in order for the Association to hear farther on the subject, as it might occasion them some entanglement with the Board. Mr. Robins then barely observed that the Board had passed no such order as had been charged upon them by Mr. P. & that it behooved us to wait till they had had a final action on the question of books.

I should have much more regretted the offensive remarks had not Mr. Robins been there to have replied to them so ably, because I fear a wrong impression would have been left on the minds of many. There were at the time about a hundred clergymen & perhaps as many other persons in the church. Mr. P. in explaining, said, he wished what he had said on the matter in question might not be carried beyond that assembly, or that no public use might be made of it. But he ought to have remembered that what he said there could not be blotted out so easy. I believe I have given you the leading facts as they occurred. I trust they cannot in any *candid* minds excite any suspicion of distrust; as the community as far as I know have full confidence in the abilities & motives of the Board; & especially of their Secretary. Your report supplementary [this word is damaged by the seal] on school houses &c. is just the thing. We have seen in a few years past a good improvement in the structure of churches, & court houses, & but very little improvement in that of schoolhouses.

As to the character of books, I find no committees that want any party religion in them, or anything sectarian. We want the cardinal virtues as you have well expressed in your report, (page, 62 & 65.)

Your sincere friend & servant,

Enoch Sanford.

Appendix C

THE following letter was accompanied by an offer of the signers to contribute $5,000 toward the expense of erecting permanent buildings for the normal schools at Westfield and Bridgewater on condition that the legislature would appropriate an equal amount.

Boston Jan. 13th 1845

Honorable Horace Mann,
Dear Sir,

Some of your friends, penetrated by a grateful sense of your peculiar & important services to the Commonwealth & to humanity, venture to intrude upon those feelings of delicacy & reserve which belong to your character. We cannot regard your services in silence, or with the apparent indifference of which silence may be a badge.

It is to you that we are indebted for the new & strong interest which has been awakened in the cause of *Education*. Your noble ardour, inspiring others with kindred emotion; your conscientious dedication to this cause of all your hours & of all those remarkable powers of eloquence & persuasion, with which you have been blessed; your marvellous application, undissipated & unwearied; your various labors, shrinking from no details or drudgery of duty, & affording you in their performance your chief delight,—all these have breathed into our community the breath of a new life.

We have learned from you, beyond even the precepts of our Fathers, the priceless value of the *Common Schools*. You have shewn most especially, that the conservation of republican institutions depends on the knowledge & virtue of the people, the great bower-anchors which can alone hold us fast to the moorings of peace & prosperity.

You have demonstrated, by most interesting details & considerations, that the arm of industry is nerved, & the wealth of the country is augmented, in proportion to the diffusion of knowledge; so that each humble school-house is to be regarded, not only as a nursery of souls, but a mine of riches.

We have learned through you to appreciate those genial modes of instruction, by which the pupil is won, & not driven into the paths of knowledge; by which he is induced to recognise the sweets of learning & to pursue it for its own sake.

While we have learned from you to abate somewhat of our confi-

dence in the comparative merits of our own system of public education, we have been filled with the desire to import from other States & Nations, whatever of improvement or light, they may be able to furnish; in short, to naturalize, in our own country, the virtues of foreign lands.

As you have given new importance to the subject of Education, so you have elevated the position & character of our Schoolmasters; vindicating for them the esteem & consideration which are properly due to those, into whose hands are delivered, as precious hostages for the Future, the children of the Commonwealth. For your services in this regard alone, you have earned the benediction of the Ancient Poet:

> Di, majorum umbris tenuem, et sine pondere terram,
> Spirantesque crocos, et in urna perpetuum ver,
> Qui praeceptorem sancti voluere parentis
> Esse loco. . . .

By the mass of your labors you have contributed essentially to the happiness & prosperity of the Commonwealth, & to its fame abroad. Your name helps to make the name of Massachusetts respectable throughout our own country, & in distant lands.

If it be true, as has been said, that he is a benefactor, who makes two blades of grass to grow where only one grew before, how much more is he a benefactor, who infuses new energies into a whole people, doubling in ten thousand souls the capacities for usefulness & happiness!

To you, as the Author of so much good, we wish to offer our sincere thanks. We feel a debt of gratitude, which it will be always our pleasure, still paying, still to owe. These are no mere words of course, but the spontaneous tribute of the heart.

In the contemplation of the successful result of your labors, you must find springs of encouragement, to which little can be added by any words of ours. Such words would be drowned in the voice of the good you have done, speaking from the Past, & bidding you to be of good cheer for the Future. Let hope elevate, & joy brighten your countenance!

But we cannot dissemble from you what you discern so much more clearly than ourselves, that, although much has been done, much more remains to be done. In the warfare with ignorance, there is neither peace, nor neutrality. The enemy is always among us, in extensive

encampment, wakeful, & ready for the contest. In this warfare you are our leader. Our services & sympathies will be always at your command. We would join with you on all possible occasions, & in all possible ways, to advance the cause to which your life is devoted.

May God continue to you strength for your labors! & may the happiness which you have diffused among your fellow-men be reflected into your own fireside!

We are, dear Sir, with sentiments of affection & respect, your sincere friends,

Josiah Quincy, Jr.
G. F. Thayer
Geo. B. Emerson
Geo. S. Hillard
Edward Jarvis
C. C. Felton
Henry W. Longfellow
R. C. Waterston
S. G. Howe
Charles Sedgwick
John D. Fisher
James K. Mills
Wm. Henry Thayer
Charles Sumner
Ezra S. Gannett
T. P. Chandler
Stephen Fairbanks
Nath. H. Emmons
G. Francis Thayer
John S. Sleeper
Francis Bowen
Ch. K. Dillaway
Wm. Brigham
I. F. Flagg
V. W. Bayley
M. S. Perry
Edw. E. Loring
Jos. Hale Abbot
J. F. Bumstead
Wm. B. Fowle
Charles Brooks
C. F. Barnard
Thomas Cushing, Jr.
Jos. W. Ingraham

Bibliography

Manuscripts

The Mann Papers, including Horace Mann's Journal: a collection of several thousand letters and papers, the property of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.

Minutes of the Meetings of the Massachusetts Board of Education, 1837-1848. Department of Education, State House, Boston.

Report of the Committee on Education in the House of Representatives, 1827. Mass. Archives. Acts 1826, Chapter 143, H. R. No. 29.

Parish Records of the First Church in Dedham.

Newspapers and Periodicals

American Biblical Repository, 1838, 1839.
American Journal of Education, 1856-1882.
Boston Daily Advertiser and Patriot, 1827, 1839, 1840, 1843.
Boston Quarterly Review, 1838-1841.
Boston Recorder, 1824-1827, 1836-1849.
Brownson's Quarterly Review, 1844-1848.
Christian Examiner, 1827, 1845, 1848.
Christian Reflector, 1842-1847.
Christian Register, 1844, 1845.
Christian Witness and Church Advocate, 1844.
Common School Journal, 1838-1848.
Connecticut Common School Journal, 1849-1855.
Mercantile Journal, 1843, 1844.
National Aegis, 1827.
New England Puritan, 1841-1847.
New Englander, 1843-1848.
New York Observer, 1836-1849.
North American Review, 1820-1830, 1848.
Princeton Review, 1829-1848, 1866.
Salem Gazette, 1827.
Trumpet and Universalist Magazine, 1838, 1839.

Horace Mann's Titles

Annual Reports of the Secretary of the Board of Education, 1838-1849. These were published by the State together with the Reports of the Board of Education.

Report of the Secretary of the Board of Education on the Subject of Schoolhouses, Supplementary to his First Annual Report, 1838. Published by the State.

Abstracts of the Massachusetts School Returns, 1838-1849. Published by the State.

Lectures, and Annual Reports, on Education. Cambridge, 1867.

Annual Reports of the Secretary of the Board of Education of Massachusetts for the years of 1837-1838, including the First Annual Report of the Board of Education, to which are prefixed Lectures on Education. "Life and Works of Horace Mann," Vol. II. Boston, 1891.

Annual Reports of the Secretary of the Board of Education of Massachusetts for the years 1839-1844. "Life and Works of Horace Mann," Vol. III. Boston, 1891.

Annual Reports of the Secretary of the Board of Education of Massachusetts for the years 1845-1848, and Oration delivered before the Authorities of the City of Boston, July 4, 1842. "Life and Works of Horace Mann," Vol. IV. Boston, 1891.

Educational Writings of Horace Mann, containing contributions to The Common School Journal and Addresses of the President of Antioch College, with an Appendix containing a Review of Horace Mann's Works and Writings, by Félix Pécaut. "Life and Works of Horace Mann," Vol. V. Boston, 1891.

The Common School Journal. Boston, 1838-1848.

Pamphlets Relating to Mr. Mann's Controversies

The Common School Controversy; consisting of Three Letters of the Secretary of the Board of Education, of the State of Massachusetts, in reply to Charges preferred against the Board, by the Editor of the Christian Witness and by Edward A. Newton, Esq., of Pittsfield, Once a Member of the Board; to which are added Extracts from the Daily Press, in regard to the Controversy. Boston, 1844.

Remarks on the Seventh Annual Report of the Hon. Horace Mann, Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education. Boston, 1844.

George B. Emerson: Observations on a Pamphlet, entitled "Remarks on the Seventh Annual Report of the Hon. Horace Mann; Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education." Boston, 1844.

Horace Mann: Reply to the "Remarks" of Thirty-one Schoolmasters on the Seventh Annual Report of the Hon. Horace Mann; Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education. Boston, 1844.

[Leonard Withington]: Penitential Tears; or A Cry From the Dust, by "The Thirty-one," Prostrated and Pulverized by the Hand of Horace Mann, Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education. Boston, 1845.

Rejoinder to the "Reply" of the Hon. Horace Mann, Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, to the "Remarks" of the Association of Boston Masters, upon his Seventh Annual Report. Boston, 1845.

Horace Mann: Answer to the "Rejoinder" of Twenty-nine Boston Schoolmasters, part of the "Thirty-one" who published "Remarks" on the Seventh Annual Report of the Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education. Boston, 1845.

The Bible, the Rod, and Religion, in Common Schools. Boston, 1847.

This pamphlet contains the following titles:

The Ark of God on a New Cart, by M. Hale Smith.
Review of the Sermon, by Wm. B. Fowle.
Strictures on the Sectarian Character of the Common School Journal, by a Member of the Massachusetts Board of Education.
Correspondence between the Hon. Horace Mann, Secretary of the Board of Education, and Rev. Matthew Hale Smith.

Horace Mann: Sequel to the So-called Correspondence between the Rev. M. H. Smith and Horace Mann. Surreptitiously published by Mr. Smith; containing a Letter from Mr. Mann, suppressed by Mr. Smith, with the Reply therein Promised. Boston, 1847.

Matthew Hale Smith: Reply to the Sequel of Hon. Horace Mann, being a Supplement to the Bible, the Rod, and Religion, in Common Schools. Boston, 1847.

Other Pamphlets

Address of His Excellency Governor Marcus Morton to the Two Branches of the Legislature on the Organization of the Government for the Political Year Commencing Jan. 1, 1840. House Document No. 9. In the Yale University Library, Kingsley Pamphlets, Vol. 24.

Answer of the Whig Members of the Legislature of Massachusetts, constituting a Majority of both branches to the address of His Excellency Marcus Morton, delivered in the Convention of the two Houses, Jan. 22, 1840. Boston, 1840.

Address of the Whig Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of Massachusetts, to their Constituents, Occasioned by the Inaugural Address of His Excellency, Marcus Morton. Boston, 1843.

American Unitarianism; or a Brief History of "The Progress and Present State of the Unitarian Churches in America." Compiled from Documents and Information communicated by the Rev. James Freeman, D.D., and William Wells, Jun. Esq., of Boston, and from other Unitarian Gentlemen in this Country, by Rev. Thomas Belsham, Essex-Street, London. Extracted from his "Memoirs of the Life of the Reverend Theophilus Lindsey," printed in London, 1812, and now published for the benefit of the Christian Churches in this Country, without note or alteration. Second Edition. Boston, 1815. In the Yale University Library, College Pamphlets, Vol. 1640; other copies in Vols. 1236 and 1237.

Charles J. Bullock: Historical Sketch of the Finances and Financial Policy of Massachusetts from 1780-1905. Publications of the American Economic Association. May, 1907.

James G. Carter: Essays upon Popular Education; containing a Particular Examination of the Schools of Massachusetts, and an Outline of an Institution for the Education of Teachers. Boston, 1826.

James G. Carter: Letters to the Hon. William Prescott, LL.D., on the Free Schools of New England, with Remarks on the Principles of Instruction. Boston, 1824.

William E. Channing: A Letter to the Rev. Samuel Thacher, on the Aspersions contained in a Late Number of the Panoplist, on the Ministers of Boston and the Vicinity: By William E. Channing, Minister of the Church of Christ in

Federal Street, Boston. Second Edition. Boston, 1815. Yale University Library, College Pamphlets, Vol. 1236.

Documents in Relation to the Massachusetts Claim: House Document 54, 1838. In Yale University Library, U. S. Political Pamphlets, Vol. 6.

J. P. Gordy: Rise and Growth of the Normal School Idea in the United States. In U. S. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 8, 1891.

George H. Griffin: Frederick A. Packard, A Memorial Discourse Given in the First Church, Springfield, Sunday Evening, Oct. 19, 1890. Philadelphia, 1890.

Inauguration of the statue of Horace Mann, in the state-house grounds, Boston, Massachusetts, July 4, 1865, with addresses of Governor Andrews, John D. Philbrick, President Hill, Dr. S. G. Howe, and others. Boston.

Proceedings of the Massachusetts Democratic State Convention, held at the Temple, in Boston, on Wednesday, October 2, 1839. In Yale University Library, U. S. Political Pamphlets, Vol. 6.

History and Biography

Abbott, Jacob: The Young Christian, Memorial Edition with a Sketch of the Author by One of his Sons. New York, 1882.

Allen, Joseph Henry: Historical Sketch of the Unitarian Movement Since the Reformation. New York, 1894.

Barnard, Henry: American Educational Biography, Memoirs of Teachers, Educators, and Promoters of Education, Science and Literature. With twenty-six steel portraits. Syracuse, N. Y., 1874.

Brownson, Orestes Augustus: The Convert; or, Leaves from My Experience. New York, 1857.

Buckley, James M.: A History of Methodism in the United States, Vol. I. New York and London, 1898.

Chadwick, John White: William Ellery Channing, Minister of Religion. New York, 1903.

Channing, William Henry: Memoir of William Ellery Channing, with Extracts from his Correspondence and Manuscripts. Second Edition. 3 vols. Boston, 1848.

Clark, Joseph S.: A Historical Sketch of the Congregational Churches in Massachusetts, from 1620 to 1858, with an Appendix. Boston, 1858.

Cubberley, Ellwood P.: Public Education in the United States. Cambridge, 1919.

—— The History of Education. Educational Practice and Progress Considered as a Phase of the Development and Spread of Western Civilization. Cambridge, 1920.

Darling, Arthur B.: Political Changes in Massachusetts, 1824-1848. New Haven, 1925.

Eddy, Richard: History of Universalism. New York, 1894.

Frothingham, O. B.: Boston Unitarianism, 1820-1850. A Study of the Life and Work of Nathaniel Langdon Frothingham. New York, 1890.

Frothingham, Paul Revere: Edward Everett, Orator and Statesman. Boston, 1925.

Hinsdale, B. A.: Horace Mann and the Common School Revival in the United States. New York, 1898.

Hudson, Charles: A History of the Town of Lexington, Middlesex County, Massachusetts, from its First Settlement to 1868, with a Genealogical Register of Lexington Families. Boston, 1868.

Hunnewell, James F.: A Century of Town Life: A History of Charlestown, Massachusetts, 1775-1887. Boston, 1888.

Littlefield, George E.: Early Schools and School-Books of New England. Boston, 1904.

Lockwood, John H.: Westfield and its Historical Influences, 1669-1919. The Life of an Early Town, with a Survey of Events in New England and Bordering Regions to which it was Related in Colonial and Revolutionary Times. 2 vols. Westfield, 1922.

Loring, James Spear: The Hundred Boston Orators, Appointed by Municipal Authorities and other Public Bodies, from 1720 to 1852. Comprising Historic Gleanings Illustrating the Principles and Progress of Republican Institutions. Boston, 1852.

Mann, Mary: Life of Horace Mann, By His Wife. New Edition. Boston, 1888. This volume was copyrighted by Mrs. Mary Mann in 1867, and constitutes Vol. I of the "Life and Works of Horace Mann." 5 vols. Boston, 1891.

Martin, George H.: The Evolution of the Massachusetts Public School System, A Historical Sketch. New York, 1894.

Marvin, Abijah P.: History of the Town of Lancaster, Massachusetts. Lancaster, 1879.

Mayo, A. D.: Horace Mann and the great Revival of the Common School. An Article in the Report of the United States Commissioner of Education for 1896-1897, I, 715-767.

Memorial Biographies of the New England Historic Genealogical Society, Vol. III.

A Memorial of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Incorporation of the Town of Barre, June 17, 1874. Cambridge, 1875.

Mowry, Arthur M.: The Dorr War, or the Constitutional Struggle in Rhode Island. Providence, 1901.

Newman, A. H.: A History of the Baptist Church in the United States. New York, 1894.

O'Gorman, Thomas: A History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States. New York, 1895.

Park, Edwards A.: Memoir of Nathanael Emmons; with Sketches of his Friends and Pupils. Boston, 1861.

Pattee, William S.: A History of Old Braintree and Quincy. Quincy, 1878.

Pierce, E. L.: Memoir and Letters of Charles Sumner. 4 vols. Boston, 1877.

Proceedings of Lexington Historical Society, and Papers Relating to the History of the Town. Read by some of the Members, Vol. I. Lexington, 1890.

The Religious History of New England; King's Chapel Lectures, by John Winthrop Platner, William W. Fenn, George E. Horr, Rufus M. Jones, George Hodges, William E. Huntington, John Coleman Adams, William L. Worcester. Cambridge, 1917.

Rice, Edwin Wilbur: The Sunday-School Movement, 1780-1917, and the American Sunday-School Union, 1817-1917. Philadelphia, 1917.

Richards, Laura E.: Letters and Journals of Samuel Gridley Howe. 2 vols. Boston, 1906, 1909.

Richards, William C.: A Memorial of George N. Briggs. Boston, 1867.
Robbins, Thomas: Diary, edited by Increase N. Tarbox. Kept during the years from 1796 to 1854. 2 vols. Boston, 1887.
Smith, J. E. A.: History of Pittsfield, 1800 to 1876. Springfield, 1876.
Smith, John Montague: History of the Town of Sunderland. Greenfield, 1899.
Smith, Matthew Hale: Universalism Not of God. An Examination of the System of Universalism; its Doctrine, Arguments, and Fruits, with the Experience of the Author, during a Ministry of Twelve Years. New York, 1847.
Steiner, B. C.: Life of Henry Barnard, the first United States Commissioner of Education, 1867-1870. U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1919, No. 8.
Temple, J. H.: A History of North Brookfield, Massachusetts. North Brookfield, 1887.
Thomas, Allen C. and Richard H.: History of the Society of Friends in America. New York, 1894.
Tiffany, Charles C.: A History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. New York, 1895.
Walker, George Leon: Some Aspects of the Religious Life of New England with Special Reference to Congregationalists. Boston, 1897.
Walker, Williston: A History of the Congregational Churches in the United States. New York, 1894.
Weiss, John: Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker. 2 vols. New York, 1864.

Other Sources

Buck, Edward: Massachusetts Ecclesiastical Law. Boston, 1866.
Combe, George: The Constitution of Man Considered in Relation to External Objects, Second American Edition. Boston, 1833.
Covenant of the First Church in Dedham, with some Facts of History and Illustration of Doctrine. For the Use of the Church. Dedham, Mass., 1878.
The Works of Samuel Hopkins, D.D., First Pastor of the Church in Great Barrington, Mass., afterward Pastor of the First Congregational Church in Newport, R. I. With a Memoir of his Life and Character. In Three Volumes. Boston, 1852.
Hough, Franklin B.: American Constitutions, Vol. I. Albany, 1872.
Ide, Jacob: The Works of Nathanael Emmons, D.D., late Pastor of the Church in Franklin, Mass. With a Memoir of his Life. 6 vols. Boston, 1842.
[Packard, Frederick A.]: Thoughts on the Condition and Prospects of Popular Education in the United States, By a Citizen of Philadelphia. College Pamphlets 2023.
[Packard, Frederick A.]: The Question, Will the Christian Religion be Recognized as the Basis of the System of Public Instruction in Massachusetts? Discussed in Four Letters to the Rev. Dr. Humphrey, President of Amherst College. Boston, 1839.
[Packard, Frederick A.]: Review of the *Life of Horace Mann*, by His Wife. Princeton Review, Vol. 38 (1866), pp. 74 ff.
Twenty-second Annual Report of the Massachusetts Board of Education.
The 13th, 14th, 15th, and 17th Annual Reports of the American Sunday School Union, Philadelphia, 1837-1841.

Index

Abbott, Rev. Gorham D., 132.
Abbott, Rev. Jacob, 116-118, 132, 180, 211.
Abbott, Rev. John S. C., author of *The Child at Home,* 116.
Adams, John Quincy, 213.
Adams, William J., 189.
Allen, Joseph Henry, 11.
American Asylum for the Deaf, 116.
American Institute of Instruction, 29.
American Sunday School Union, 55, 71, 108, 155.
American Unitarian Association, founded 1825, 17.
American Unitarianism, published, 10.
Amherst College, 155.
Andover Theological Seminary, founded, 9; creed, 9.
Annual Reports of Horace Mann, 39.

Baptists in Massachusetts, 7; "Free Will Baptists," 7, 8; statistics in 1800 and 1858, 7, 8; win freedom from taxation to support Congregational Church, 14.
Barnard, Henry, 19, 37, 38; declines principalship of normal school, 167.
Barre Normal School, opened, 122; closed, 167; moved to Westfield, 167.
Bates, Rev. Joshua, 15, 16.
Bates, William G., 163, 176.
Belsham, Rev. Thomas, 10.
Bible in Schools, 124, 183, 186, 201-209, 237, 238.
Bill of Rights, adopted, 14, 15; amended 1833, 18.
Board of Education, established in 1837, 30; first members, 31; attacked in legislature, 136-141.
Boston and Albany Railroad, 174.
Boston Association of Friends of Ireland, founded, 149.
Boston Daily Advertiser and Patriot, 102, 177.
Boston Quarterly Review, 127, 128, 135, 149.
Boston Recorder, founded, 10; 55, 61, 89, 90, 94-102, 177, 202, 206.
Boston Schoolmasters, controversy with, 188-204.
Bowdoin College, 121.
Bridgewater Normal School, opened, 122.
Briggs, George N., 122, 151.
Brimmer, Martin, 169.
Brooks, Rev. Charles, 111.
Brownson, Orestes A., 127-130, 147, 149, 198.
Buck, Edward, 14, 15.
Burnside, S. M., works for passage of Law of 1827, 23; 187, 218, 219.

Calhoun, William B., 88, 90, 155.
Carey, Rev. Austin, 157.
Carter, James G., arouses interest in common schools, 19, 28; draws up bill creating Board of Education, 30; Henry Barnard's estimate of, 19; member first Board of Education, 32; efforts in behalf of normal schools, 111.
Catechism in Schools, 183-187, 217.
Catholics (*See* Roman Catholics).
Chadwick, John White, 8.
Channing, William Ellery, 6, 8, 11-13, 16, 127, 160, 229.
Chase, John, 169.
Chauncy, Rev. Charles, 6.
Christian Church, 8.
Christian Reflector, 187.
Christian Witness and Church Advocate, 182, 217.
Churches, religious sects at opening of nineteenth century, 3-8; Dissenters, 7; statistics for 1800 and 1858, 7, 8; church membership required for franchise, 13; ecclesiastical test abolished in 1691, 13; taxation for support of churches, 14; Religious Freedom Act of 1811, 14; revivals, 3, 8, 9; selection of ministers, 14, 15.
Clark, Joseph S., 7, 8, 17.
"Clericus Hampdenensis," 95.

Codman, Rev. John, 10.
Colby College, 119.
Combe, George, 123, 151, 153, 159, 187, 190, 193, 210, 214, 215.
Common School Controversy, 23, 183-187.
Common School Journal, 40, 91, 106, 114, 135, 167, 181, 210.
Congregational Church, three parties, 3-7; the established church, 7, 8, 13; church membership required for citizenship, 13; supported by taxation, 14; church property lost to Unitarians, 17; statistics, 17; disestablished, 18.
"Consistent Calvinists," 5, 224.
Cubberley, Ellwood P., 111, 233-235.

Darling, Arthur B., 129, 171.
Davis, Rev. Emerson, 32, 86, 116, 124, 167, 222-224.
Dedham Case, 13-18; results of, 18, 27, 218.
Dedham, First Church schism, 15-18.
Democratic Party in Massachusetts, 129-131, 151, 152, 171.
Depravity, doctrine of, 3-5.
Dissenters in Massachusetts, 7; win religious freedom, 18.
District school system legalized, 19; regulated, 20.
Dodge, Allen W., 130, 136-145, 152, 153, 200.
Dodge, Rev. O. H., 103-105, 115.
"Dorr War," 171.
Dutton, S. W. S., 212.
Dwight, Edmund, 32; urges Horace Mann to accept secretaryship, 34; 112, 129, 154.
Dwight, Louis, 96-99, 101.

Ecclesiastical tests for citizenship, 13.
"Edwardeans," 4.
Edwards, Jonathan, 3-5.
Election, doctrine of, 3-5, 226.
Eliot Church, founded in Roxbury, 117.
Emerson, Frederick, 136, 145, 159, 199.
Emerson, George B., 30, 39, 159, 169, 198, 206.
Emmons, Rev. Nathaniel, 4, 5, 224-227.
Episcopal Church in Massachusetts, 7, 8; members win permission to have taxes paid to own church, 181, 186.
"Evangelical Reawakening," 8; revival starts in North Yarmouth, Maine, 9.
Evarts, Jeremiah, 11.
Everett, Edward, recommends creation of Board of Education, 30; 31, 68, 75, 81, 122.

Fay, Rev. Warren, 66, 101, 103, 104.
Federal Street Church, now Arlington Street Church, 229.
Fenn, William W., 6.
"Fifteen-gallon Law," 131.
Four Letters to Dr. Humphrey, 92, 101, 102, 106-109, 154, 210.
Fowle, William B., 214.
Freeman, Rev. James, 10.
Frothingham, Paul Revere, *Edward Everett, Orator and Statesman*, 30.

Gallaudet, Rev. Thomas Hopkins, 116.
Garrison, William Lloyd, 231.
Girard College, 182-185.
Girard, Stephen, 182.
"Great Awakening," 3.
Greene, Thomas A., 138.
Griffin, Rev. Edward D., 9.

Hale, Joseph, 194-196.
Hall, Rev. Samuel R., 111.
Harvard College, 9; Hollis Professorship of Divinity filled by a Liberal, 9; 154.
Hinsdale, B. A., 19, 39, 123, 190.
Holmes, Sylvester, 53.
Hopkins, Samuel, 4, 5.
"Hopkinsians," 4, 10, 196, 224.
Hough, Franklin B., 15.
Howe, Julia Ward, 180.
Howe, Samuel Gridley, 123, 127, 142, 158-160; marries Julia Ward, 180; 198, 201, 213, 231.
Hudson, Charles, 104, 115.
Hull, George, member first Board of Education, 32.
Humphrey, Heman, 85, 92, 108, 155, 165, 179, 186.
Hunnewell, J. F., 103.

Insane, State Hospital at Worcester, established 1830, 33.
Irish Catholic immigration, 220.

James, John Warren, 149, 176.
Jarvis, Dr. E., 188.

Keely, George W., 118.
Kendall, Rev. James, 9.
King's Chapel, 11.
King's Chapel Lectures on The Religious History of New England, 6.

Lamson, Rev. Alvan, 16.
Laws regarding churches in Massachusetts, 13-15; church membership required for citizenship, 13; ecclesiastical test abolished by Charter of 1691, 13; taxation for support of churches, 14; Religious Freedom Act of 1811, 14; selection of ministers by church members, 14; reversed, law giving authority to town 1692, 15; reversed in 1693, 15; Law of 1695 provides for church council, 15; Declaration of Rights gives authority to select minister to town or parish, 15.
Laws regarding schools in Massachusetts, districts legalized 1789, 19; districts empowered to tax themselves 1800, 19; districts made corporations 1817, 19; prudential committeeman to employ teacher and care for school property, 1827, 19; Law of 1826 checks districts, 20; Law of 1827 requires moral and religious instruction and forbids sectarian textbooks; reënacted in 1835, 21-28; School fund created 1834, 29, 130; Board of Education and Secretaryship created 1837, 30-32; taxation for school libraries authorized 1837, 43, 90; legislative grant for school libraries 1842, 165, 177, 178; normal schools authorized 1838, 112, 113; legislative grant for normal schools 1842, 165.
Lexington Normal School, opened, 120.
Library for Massachusetts schools, 41-54, 149-151, 162, 165, 167-169, 172-178, 183, 190, 207.
Longfellow, Henry W., 201.

Maine, funds from state lands owned by Massachusetts used for school fund, 29.
Mann, Horace, tradition regarding responsibility for secularizing schools, 1; graduate of Brown University, 32; legal and public career prior to 1837, 32, 33; marriage to Charlotte Messer, 33; death of Mrs. Mann, 33; efforts for establishment of State Hospital for Insane at Worcester, 33; becomes secretary of Board of Education, 34-37; methods of work, 38-40; lectures, 39; annual reports, 39; calls attention to Law of 1827 and needs for moral and religious instruction, 41-43; proposes creation of school library, 43; controversy with F. A. Packard, 55-82; views regarding moral and religious education, 63, 64, 170, 207-209, 213; letter to Rev. R. S. Storrs, 96; organization of normal schools, 111-124; declines college presidency, 133; wins fight against enemies in legislature, 136-148; wins second fight, 149-154; secures legislative grants for normal schools and school libraries, 164-166; marries Mary Peabody 1843, and sails for study of education in Europe, 179, 180; invited to deliver Fourth of July oration in Boston, 169; controversy with E. A. Newton, 181-188; controversy with Boston schoolmasters, 189-200; tribute by thirty-four citizens, 201; controversy with M. H. Smith, 204-210; elected to Congress and resigns secretaryship, 213-216; childhood religious experience, 224-228; helps to found First Unitarian Society in Newton, 229; sensitive disposition, 230-232; attitude toward Orthodox, 224-233; contribution to religious teaching in schools, 235-238; death, 221.
Mann, Lydia B., 178.
Mann, Mary, 1, 2, 98, 131, 180, 200.
"Mann Papers," 1, 119, 138, 165, 188.
Martin, G. H., 19, 30.
Massachusetts Claim, 29, 130.
Massachusetts General Association, 65, 210.
Massachusetts Historical Society, 1.

May, Rev. Samuel J., 167, 197.
Mayhew, Rev. Jonathan, 6.
Mayo, Lawrence Shaw, 229.
Mercantile Journal, 199.
Messer, Asa, president of Brown University, 33.
Methodists in Massachusetts, 7, 8; Wesleyan Methodists, 8.
Middlebury College, 16.
Middlesex County Association, 104.
"Militia Claim," 130.
Ministry, support, 13, 14; selection by church members, 14; selection by parish, 15.
Minutes of meetings of Massachusetts Board of Education, 31, 44, 45, 46, 49, 53, 81, 85, 214.
Morse, Rev. Jedediah, 10.
Morse, Sidney E., 10.
Morton, Marcus, 131-136, 149-152, 171-174.

"New Divinity," 4, 10.
New Englander, The, 83, 210.
"New Lights," 3, 4.
Newman, Samuel P., 121, 166.
Newton, E. A., 32, 45; opposes creation of School Library, 46; resignation accepted, 48; 101, 163, 164, 181-188.
New York Observer, 27, 55, 71, 83, 85, 87.
Normal Schools, 111-126; defended in legislature, 140; legislative grants for, 165; gift for new buildings, 201.
North American Review, 20, 90, 177.

"Old Calvinists," 3, 9.
"Orthodox Reaction," 8.

Packard, Frederick A., 55, 57; habit of writing anonymously, 70, 83; author of *Four Letters to Dr. Humphrey,* 94; 147, 155, 164, 182, 199, 210, 211, 220-222.
Page, D. P., 211-213.
Panoplist, 11.
Park Street Church, 9.
Parker, Rev. S. P., 145, 157.
Parker, Theodore, 231.
Peabody, Mary, marries Horace Mann, 180.
Peirce, Cyrus, 119-121, 167, 205.
Phalen, Rev. Paul S., 229.
Phillips, Jonathan, 90.
Phillips, Stephen C., 169.
Pilgrim Church at Plymouth, calls a Liberal minister, 9.
Potter, Alonzo, 118, 169.
Presbyterians in Massachusetts, 8; proposal to establish parochial schools, 220.
Princeton College, 5.
Princeton Review, 154, 156.
Putnam, Rev. George, 85, 124, 155.

Quakers in Massachusetts, 7, 8; win permission to have taxes paid to own church, 14.
Quincy, Josiah, Jr., 201.

Rantoul, Robert, Jr., 32, 90, 124, 128, 151, 159.
Reports of Horace Mann, 39.
Reprobation, doctrine of, 5, 226.
Revivals, "Great Awakening," 3; "Evangelical Reawakening," 8, 9.
Revolutionary War, contributes to decline of schools, 19.
Rice, Edwin Wilbur, 83.
Robbins, Thomas, 32, 45; biographical note, 49; 65, 77, 116, 150, 151.
Roman Catholics in Massachusetts, 7, 8, 154, 219, 220, 238.

Sanford, Rev. Enoch, 66.
Schoolhouses, *Supplementary Report on Schoolhouses,* 39, 139, 179.
Schools, movement toward betterment of, 19-40; causes of decline, 19; legislation regarding common schools, 19-32, 43, 90, 130, 165, 177, 178; district system, 19, 20; sectarian textbooks forbidden, 22-28; school fund created 1834, 29, 172-174; school returns required, 29, 39; Board of Education and secretaryship established 1837, 30; Massachusetts School Library, 41-54, 149-151, 162, 165, 167-169, 172-178, 183, 190, 207; Bible in schools, 124, 183, 186, 201-209,

237, 238; corporal punishment in Boston, 191, 192.
Sears, Rev. Barnas, 214.
Second Adventists in Massachusetts, 8.
"Select Library" of American Sunday School Union, 55, 72, 147, 155.
Shakers, 8, 162.
Shaw, John A., 138-141.
Smith, Matthew Hale, 204-210, 222.
Smith, Sherman M., *The Relation of the State to Religious Education in Massachusetts*, 33.
Snell, Ebenezer S., 118.
Snell, Rev. Thomas, 66, 118.
Sparks, Jared, 13, 32, 44, 124, 151.
"Standing Order," disestablished, 18.
Storrs, Rev. Richard S., 94, 96-101, 114, 124, 126, 179, 222.
Stowe, Rev. Calvin E., 166.
Sumner, Charles, 123, 201, 231.
Swedenborgians, 8.

Taft, Horace W., 157.
Tappan, Rev. David, 9.
Taxation for support of Congregational church, 14; for support of ministry, 13-15.
Textbooks, to be chosen by town school committee, 21; must not contain sectarian teachings, 22, 218; Mann's comment in *First Report*, 41, 140.
Thacher, Samuel C., 11.
Thayer, Gideon F., 196.
Tilden, Chester, 136, 145.
Tillinghast, Nicholas, 122.
Trumpet and Universalist Magazine, 94, 105-109.

Union College, 118.
Unitarian schism, 6, 8-18, 27.
Universalists, 7, 8, 58.

Walker, G. L., 4.
Walker, Williston, 3, 4, 5, 10.
Ward, Julia, marries Samuel Gridley Howe, 180.
Ware, Rev. Henry, 9.
Washington, George, story of hatchet and pear tree, 60, 61.
Webster, Daniel, 182-184.
Western Railroad Corporation, 174.
Whig Party in Massachusetts, 129, 172-174.
Whitefield, George, 3.
Willis, Nathaniel, 10, 96, 101.

Yale College, 5; revival, 9.
Young Christian, by Jacob Abbott, 180.

Date Due

Ap 5	DEC 16 1980		
MAY 25	NOV 17 1981		
Feb 18 '35	FEB 22 '87		
Mar 4 '35	JUN 3 '87		
Apr 27 '35	NOV 10 '87		
May 8 '35	MT. UNION		
May 26 '35			
Jun 15 '35	FEB 15 1974		
Sep 9 '35	APR 24 1991		
Oct 29 '35			
Dec 9 '35	DEC 06 1996		
Jan 11 '37			
Aug 12 '37			
Jan 4			
OCT 3 '49			
FEB 20 '50			
FEB 23 '50			
MAY 25 '53			

Mount Union College Libraries
379.744 C968h MBO
Culver, Raymond Ben/Horace Mann and reli
3 7048 00053 6371

WITHDRAWN
UNIV OF MOUNT UNION LIBRARY

